

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XLI, No. 10
WHOLE No. 1029

June 15, 1929

\$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	217-220
EDITORIALS	
Getting Ready to Do Nothing—The Klan in Jail—A Catholic Leader—Abolish Intercollegiate Athletics?—The Victory of the Labor Party—Volstead and Good Morals	221-223
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Catholic Action on the Air—What Catholics Think About—Our Lady Abbesses and Indefectibility—Shall We Repeal the Censorship Law?	224-230
SOCIOLOGY	
Capital Punishment	231-232
EDUCATION	
Let's Prepare Our Teachers!	232-233
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	233-235
POETRY	
Helen-of-Toys—Conceit—Hope—Triumph	225; 230; 235
DRAMATICS	
The Catholic Little Theater	235-236
REVIEWS	236-239
COMMUNICATIONS	239-240

Chronicle

Home News.—The farm bill came out of conference with the debenture provision eliminated and with a new name. It will hereafter be known as the Agricultural Marketing Act. The features of the bill remain the same, with slight modifications. A farm board will be set up and \$500,000,000 will be authorized but not appropriated for its use. The stabilization corporations under the board will buy and dispose of crop surpluses and will also act as marketing agencies for cooperative associations. It was expected that the revised bill would quickly pass the House, and Administration supporters were hopeful of finding a majority for it in the Senate.—The reapportionment measure, after having passed the Senate, met difficulties in the House. However, shorn of proposed amendments against aliens and Negroes in the South it passed, 271 to 104.—With the farm bill out of the way, the tariff bill was expected to bring about a recess of Congress until the Senate had completed its hearings. It was thought that Congress would reconvene in September to pass the bill. Meanwhile, a serious hint was given from the White House that the President was dissatisfied with the measure and was disposed to veto it if

it reached him in its present form. His motive for this was expected to be that it did not satisfy campaign pledges of a limited revision in some schedules. The President was said to be studying the bill through a committee of experts and at the same time through his secretaries investigating the state of public opinion. It was said that more than ninety per cent of the editorials studied were hostile to the Hawley Bill.—On June 6, the President in a special message to Congress requested the appointment of a joint Congressional committee to study the reorganization of Federal bureaus concerned with Prohibition enforcement.

Secretary of the Interior Wilbur took his first steps in the matter of Federal education when, on June 5, he announced the appointment of an advisory committee to study the present relations of the Federal Government to education. Charles R. Mann, of the American Council of Education, will be general chairman, and J. W. Crabtree, Secretary of the National Education Association, will be secretary. The committee is divided into three sub-committees to study respectively: the educational activities of the United States Government, subsidies of the Federal Government to colleges, and subsidies for education of less than college grade. Prominent Catholics on the committee were the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A. Pace and the Rev. George Johnson, both of the Catholic University.

Afghanistan.—After his failure during May in a series of attempts to regain his throne, the former King Amanullah left Afghanistan hurriedly and fled to India, whence he took boat from Bombay for Europe. Amanullah, because of his excessive desire to introduce so-called European reforms in Afghanistan, was driven out of the capital city, Kabul, in February last, by rebel tribesmen. Bacha Sakao, the leader of one of the bands, usurped the Government and made himself Emir under the title of Habibullah. He has succeeded in holding control of the country despite the offensive attack organized by Amanullah, who had been collecting his forces at Kandahar. The attack was abandoned by Amanullah when the Ghilzai tribesmen, on whose loyalty he had depended, deserted him. With his departure, two other claimants to the throne came forward. One of these, Ali Ahmen Jan, Emir of Jalalabad, who declared himself Emir of Kandahar, was reported to have been captured by Habibullah's troops. The other, Nadir Khan, was said to be collecting soldiers in Eastern Afghanistan for an attack on Kabul.

Austria.—On June 2 at Moechling, near Vienna, the Heimwehr or Fascist troops again came in sharp collision with the Socialists. It seems that the fighting was started when the Fascist troops disturbed a procession of Socialist children. Many injuries resulted from the ensuing conflict, including the serious wounding of the commander of the Heimwehr, Baron Manfred. The Fascists were aided by supporters from the neighboring towns but they were quickly dispersed when the gendarmerie were rushed to the scene and prevented further disorder.

The sentiment in favor of anschluss (union with Germany) grew sufficiently strong to bring together in one demonstration the Socialists and the Heimwehr. Members of the national and provincial Parliaments from all three Austrian parties bore testimony to the general desire for anschluss when a branch of the organization for union with Germany was founded in the Kaerten Province. Deputies to the German Reichstag and Mayor Mebfeld of Cologne brought greetings from Paul Loebe, President of the Reichstag and from the German public.

Belgium.—Final official returns of the late May elections indicated that in the Senate the Catholics now have 41 seats, the Liberals 13, the Socialists 36, and the Separatists 3. This is the first time the last-mentioned party has enjoyed any Senatorial representation. In the new Chamber of Deputies the final figures give Catholics 76 as against 78 in 1925; Socialists 70 as against 78; Liberals 28 as against 23; Frontists 11 as against 6; Communists 1 as against 2; Independents 1. A single woman has a deputyship in the Chamber, Mlle. Lucie Dujardie, who was elected by the workers of Liège.

Chile.—All doubt as to the Government's attitude in the face of declarations made to the Uruguayan Congress that Chile should hear Bolivia's claim for a Pacific port was set at rest with the publication, on May 30, of an official communication from the Chilean Government to the Uruguayan Foreign Office. The note which was delivered by Chile's diplomatic representative at Montevideo said in part:

In this way my country brings to a close all of her frontier problems and none remains now to be contemplated. The frontiers of Chile are now definitely established and peace with Peru absolutely assured. Chile has already totally liquidated the Pacific war with Bolivia and now also with Peru, notwithstanding the fact that liquidation means the delivery of 8,000 square kilometers of land and about 1,000,000,000 Chilean pesos [around \$120,600,000 at the present exchange] of expenditures in the provinces in the past. I have received special instructions from my Government to declare that Chile will never break the continuity of her territory and establishes her northern frontier from the locality that will be called Concordia, twenty kilometers to the north of Arica.

The occasion for the statement was the acknowledgment of the Uruguayan felicitations on the settlement of the dispute that had been carried on through several years over Tacna-Arica.

China.—Reports that the chargé d'affaires at Moscow had been withdrawn, consequent on discoveries brought about in the recent raid of the Soviet headquarters at Mukden, were officially denied by the Nanking Government. On the other hand, it notified its Mukden legation that the raids had its approval. In consequence a strong note of protest was addressed by the Soviet Government to China. Meanwhile, the civil war was marked by brief sanguinary conflicts at Chang-chow and Swatow.

Great Britain.—Following the Labor victory in the General Election, Stanley Baldwin, the Conservative Prime Minister, offered his resignation to King George, at Windsor Castle, on June 4. On the day following, James Ramsay MacDonald, leader of the Labor party, was called to Windsor by the King and was given a commission to form a new Government. The seals of office were handed over to Mr. MacDonald on June 8. His first activity, after the formation of his Cabinet, was the preparation of the Speech from the Throne to be delivered at the opening of the new Parliament on June 25. Three issues were noted as of paramount importance by the new Premier in the preliminary outlining of the Speech: these are, the relief of unemployment, the furthering of disarmament, and the establishment of better relations with the United States and with Russia. The retiring Premier, Mr. Baldwin, had been in office since November, 1924, during all of which time he commanded an overwhelming Parliamentary majority. After the recent election, when his party was so badly defeated, some of his associates counseled him to withhold his resignation until he might be defeated by a vote in Parliament. He decided to resign immediately on the basis that, since Labor had won a clean victory at the polls, it should be given a fair chance in taking over the Government. Ramsay MacDonald was Prime Minister from January to October, 1924. His party then held 191 seats. He was defeated in a non-confidence vote on Communist activities and in the general election that followed was decisively beaten.

Complete returns, with the exception of four seats, of the election of May 30 were as follows: Labor, 288; Conservatives, 258; Liberals, 58; other groups, 7; not reported, 4. The popular vote was: Conservatives, 8,561,579; Labor, 7,306,477; Liberals, 5,220,577; other groups, 302,070. For the first time in the history of the party, Labor secured a plurality in Parliament, namely, that of thirty. It has not, however, a majority, since the combination of Conservatives and Liberals number 316, more than half of the 615 members of the House. Mr. MacDonald expressed the hope that his party would hold the Government for two years; this depended on the support afforded by Lloyd George and the Liberals who have indicated that they will use their balance of power to keep Labor in power for the time being. Coalition between the Liberals and either of the two other parties was denied by all three leaders.

Rivals
Clash

Soviet
Relations
and War

Anschluss
Revived

MacDonald
Becomes
Premier

Final
Election
Returns

Chile and
Bolivia

Election
Results

Greece.—On June 3 the Senate and Chamber elected Admiral Paul Kondouriotis, President for his second term and the following day he took the oath of office. Out of a total of 309 votes, 259 were cast in his favor. The others were distributed among Premier Venizelos, Foreign Minister Zaimis, former Premier Papanastassidu, M. Romanis and M. Zacharoff. Forty blank ballots were cast. Ten days earlier the Senate had elected as its President M. Zaimis, who has held the Premiership eight times. A few days later an extraordinary Cabinet Council was called to take action consequent on the announcement from Angora that the Kemal Government was purchasing several new warships. It was officially given out that the present Greek navy had decided to order several fast destroyers in France and to insure immediate completion of the new cruiser Salmis. Premier Venizelos, it was said, plans to treble the present navy, and, despite the fact that the financial condition of the country is low, popular support was thought to be behind his policy.

Italy.—On June 3 Mount Vesuvius, inactive since November, 1928, burst into eruption again and sent a stream of molten lava, nearly forty feet in width, from the base of a small cone on the south-east side of the crater. Alexander Maladra, director of the Vesuvian Observatory, predicted that the eruption would spend itself in a few days. Other experts agreed that there was little reason for alarm since the only real danger could come from the opening of a new crater inside the mountain. But with the lava already reaching the gates of Terzigno, the people did not share the optimism of the volcanologists and were in readiness to evacuate as soon as authorities judged such a step necessary.

Jugoslavia.—Political unrest continued in Croatia and the anti-Serb feeling was reported to have got a new impulse. Though it was still assumed by Croatian leaders that the final adjustment of the problem would be determined by economic considerations, attention was also being given to the religious phase of the dispute. While a ukase of the Government closed all private schools, the Catholic Croatians especially considered themselves hampered by this move, and it was reported that after a conference of the Croatian Bishops with the Apostolic Nuncio an episcopal delegation had been sent to Rome to place the matter before the Holy Father.

Mexico.—On June 4, General Goroztieta, Chief of the "religious rebels," was surrounded with his army at San Julian in Jalisco and killed. His body was brought to Mexico City. At the same time another determined drive of Federal forces was made against the same rebels in Colima and Michoacan, and in both States, according to Mexico City, the rebels were dispersed. If true, these announcements marked the temporary end of organized Catholic resistance in Mexico, though it was expected that

it would start up again as occasion provided. Meanwhile, it was announced from Mexico City that Archbishop Ruiz, named for the purpose Apostolic Delegate to Mexico, would arrive there to initiate negotiations with the President looking towards a settlement of the religious question. In many quarters in Mexico and the United States great optimism was expressed for a favorable outcome of these negotiations, since it was known that all parties were thoroughly anxious to reach a settlement.

Peru.—On June 3, Emiliano Figueroa-Larrain, Chilean Ambassador, and Pedro Rada y Gamio, Foreign Minister of Peru, signed the Tacna-Arica treaty at Lima, thus formally determining the half-century dispute over the two Provinces. As reported from Washington when President Hoover made the announcement of the proposed settlement, the important proviso of the treaty is that the Province of Tacna becomes part of the sovereignty of Peru, while Chile retains Arica.

Rome.—On June 7, Feast of the Sacred Heart, formal exchange of the ratifications of the Italo-Vatican Treaty, marking the end of the fifty-nine-year-old estrangement between the Quirinal and the Vatican and the creation of the Vatican City State took place between Premier Mussolini and Cardinal Gasparri. The ceremony was simple and brief consisting merely of the exchange of the originals of the document signed respectively by the Pope and the King. It took place in the Hall of Congregations in the Vatican.

Almost on the very eve of the formal exchange of the ratifications of the Lateran treaties, the *Osservatore Romano*, published a letter from Pope Pius XI addressed to Cardinal Gasparri, the Papal Secretary of State, regretting the interruption of Italo-Vatican conciliation made necessary by statements contained in Premier Mussolini's speeches before the Chamber of Deputies and before the Senate during a discussion of the Lateran treaties. In clear, forceful terms the Holy Father referred to the binding force of the Concordat on the Italian Government, saying:

We cannot have the appearance of agreeing with the vague references which would have one believe that the fate of the Lateran Treaty and the Concordat may in the future not be the same for both. We make a point of recalling and declaring that according to the agreements which have been signed it is not the Treaty alone that cannot be placed in discussion. To be even clearer, the Treaty and the Concordat, according to their letter and spirit and according also to the explicit oral and written engagements, are as one and are the necessary complements of each other and they are inseparable and unseverable. It follows that they must stand or fall together even if this should entail the fall of the State of Vatican City.

The Premier's statements to which the Holy Father directed his dignified criticism touched such vital issues as the origin of the Church and the source of her power, the sovereignty and independence of the Church in the fulfilment of her mission, the proper understanding of liberty

New
Presidential
Term

Vesuvius
Eruption

Croatian
Problem

Religious
Situation

Tacna-Arica
Settlement

Italo-Vatican
Treaty
Ratified

Concordat
Status

of conscience and liberty of discussion in matters of religion and the questions of marriage and education.

The Concordat which regulates the exact status of the Church in Italy, if it is to be an integral part of the treaty of conciliation signed at St. John Lateran on February 11, could not permit such a wide divergence of views as those expressed by the Holy Father's Reply Premier. In his speech before the Chamber, Premier Mussolini said that the Christian religion was born in Palestine and became Catholic in Rome, and that if it had remained in Palestine it might have flickered out like one of the many sects which flourished in that land. This was branded by the Holy Father as "heretical and worse than heretical." The unhappy attempt to interpret rather than retract brought the reply: "To distinguish between historical and doctrinal statements would in the most favorable hypothesis be the worst and most blameworthy modernism."

Replying to this, the Holy Father said in part

The universality of the Church, in fact, can be seen at the very beginning of the Church and of Apostolic preaching. The preaching of the Apostles soon extended beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire, which did not by any means comprise the whole known world. . . . It is always the Supreme Pontiff who intervenes and negotiates in the fullness of the sovereignty of the Catholic Church, which he does not represent but personifies by direct Divine mandate. It is not, therefore, the Catholic organization in Italy which would be subject to the sovereignty of the State but the Pontiff himself, the supreme sovereign authority of the Church, who judges what can and what must be done for the greater glory of God and for the greater good of souls. . . . The Church has never asked the State anything except to fight for a just and legitimate collaboration for the common good. . . . It is clearly and loyally understood that the Catholic religion and the Catholic religion alone is the State religion with all the logical and juridical consequences that that state implies, especially where propaganda is concerned and provided it is no less clearly and loyally understood that the Catholic religion is not merely one of the many tolerated or permitted religions, but is what the letter and spirit of the Lateran Treaties and Concordat make it. . . . Full liberty of discussion is inadmissible because some forms of discussion can easily trick unenlightened minds and become cloaks of harmful propaganda. Nor is it possible to concede full liberty of conscience as it would be like saying that creatures are not subject to the Creator . . . unless this means that it is recognized that consciences are not subject to the State, in which case it follows logically that it must also be recognized that the task of education belongs to the Church and not to the State.

The letter points out that the State has nothing to fear from the education imparted by the Church; nor have science, scientific methods, scientific research anything to fear from the development of religious instruction. Concerning marriage, he said: "In the matter of marriage the Concordat ensures such benefits for the Italian people that we would gladly have sacrificed our life for." The letter closes with a note of optimism.

Russia.—The All-Union Central Executive Committee, which was sitting in Moscow, announced the re-election of Alexei I. Rykoff as President of the Union Council of People's Commissars. The personnel of the Council, which is equivalently the Cabinet in other governments, includes Vice Presidents Y. E. Rudzutak, V. V.

Schmidt, and K. G. Ordjonikidze. Other Commissars re-elected were: Foreign Affairs, George Tchitcherin; War and Navy, Clemence Yoroshilv; Transport, Y. E. Rudzutak; Trade, A. Mikoyan; Finance, N. P. Brukhanov; Posts and Telegraphs, N. K. Antipgy; Labor, N. A. Uglanov.

Venezuela.—On May 30, Dr. Juan Bautista Perez, President of the Federal High Court on Cassation and temporary President of the Republic, was elected by Congress for the seven-year term of Chief Executive which, it will be recalled, was declined by General Juan Vincente Gomez on May 4, after having held the post for twenty years. The next day the new President was sworn in.

Reparations Question.—On June 7, the French and German texts of the proposed agreement on reparations were ready for signatures and the work of the experts of the seven nations involved, which began on February 11 last, was formally terminated. Complete agreement had been reached both on the amount Germany was to pay and on the conditions of the payment. The report of the Committee must still go to the respective Governments for approval, but it was anticipated that their recommendations would be generally accepted. Two days earlier the Belgians had accepted the German's proposal for a solution of the question of the redemption of the German marks circulated in Belgium during the War, which had been eliminated from the earlier agreement on the Young annuities. Substantially this new proposal was that the two Governments should at once enter negotiations looking to a definite settlement of the controversy. The German Government has appointed Dr. Ritter as its special representative for these discussions. While the final draft of the reparations agreement considerably modified the original claims filed by all the creditors with the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 by a decrease of \$116,000,000,000, general satisfaction was felt that the matter had been brought to a successful issue, and congratulations were received by the Committee from many sources.

Next week the last of John Gibbons' stories of his pilgrimage to Rome will be published. It will be called "The Train That Laughed" and contains more than one smile and sob.

"America and Catholic Emancipation," by Thomas F. Meehan, will be another of that historian's interesting papers in which the past is laid under timely contribution.

"Hunting First Editions" will be a very readable paper by William M. Stinson, librarian at Boston College.

In "William Penn and the Church," George Barton has set down some very interesting findings about the common accusation that William Penn was a Catholic.

New
Council
Personnel

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1929

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
CHARLES I. DOYLE
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JAMES A. GREELEY

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

Telephone: Medallion 3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

A copy of the Index for Volume XL of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Getting Ready to Do Nothing

THE President's Law Enforcement Committee has been busily engaged for some weeks. It has given ear to an exhortation from its creator, and its chairman has issued several statements. Like Mr. Micawber, it can offer nothing at present but the assurance that it is preparing for a Leap.

With all due respect to the members of this committee, we must confess that its soaring plans remind us strongly of Mr. Micawber. Perhaps, like Mr. Micawber, it may add to the gayety of nations, and at length find success in Australia. But we think that it would be an error to suspend all our efforts, such as they are, to check crime and severely to rebuke the criminal, in the hope that after a few years the Committee will be able to explain why we are so bad, and how, by one leap, we may arrive at the top of the ladder of sanctity.

The Committee will probably present us with a Report, a mine-like affair, rich in lodes of facts and figures, from which the sociologists and the statisticians will dig up large and impressive facts to heave at one another. But we have yet to see a crime wane into insignificance when confronted with percentages, graphs, and tables indicating the law of relative frequency.

As time goes on, we begin to nurture a suspicion that this very elaborate committee is nothing but a novel way of paying an election bet. The President, it will be remembered, casually remarked during the campaign that although eight years had elapsed since the passage of the Volstead Act, gin was still being bought and sold. The law, he thought, ought to be enforced, and he promised a committee empowered to look at and into this nefarious traffic.

It now appears that the Committee will not spend a great deal of time in trying to explain why so many good

citizens dismiss the Volstead Act with a pish and a tush. Its scope is to be far, far wider, since it is now charged with an investigation which will cover the whole criminal field. After the committee has concluded its labors, the President may file its report in a secluded pigeonhole in his secret archives. He may also, should he think fit, pick out certain of the more serious causes of American lawlessness, and ask Congress what can be done to remove them. But no obligation rests on him to do anything at all. And whatever he may do will impose no obligation whatever upon Congress. Thus we may have a marvelous circus procession, but no circus, and not even a calliope bringing up the rear.

Should the President and the Committee really desire to know what is the matter with this country which has more colleges and criminals than any other country in the world, let them turn to Washington's Farewell Address. But we fail to see what Congress and the President and the whole Supreme Court can do about it. What this country needs far more sorely than more laws and more committees is a little more religion and a moral code based upon religion.

We shall have neither so long as we cling to the notion that ninety per cent of our children must first be trained in schools from which religion is excluded, and then sent to colleges in which religion is nothing but an object on which every half-baked professor is entitled to crack his wit.

Reform must begin in the schools.

The Klan in Jail

WRITING in the Louisville *Courier Journal* Mr. Harold C. Feightner expresses the opinion that "the Klan has disappeared as a political factor, after having dragged the name of Indiana in the dust."

Courts, jails and penitentiaries, are the causes of this disappearance. Indiana probably suffered more than any other State from the machinations of the Klan, but no State has been more vigorous in sending leaders of the Klan to jail.

The unspeakable Stephenson who boasted "I am the law in Indiana" is now serving a life term in the penitentiary for a revolting crime. A Klan governor was indicted for dishonesty and escaped trial only by taking advantage of the statute of limitations. The Klan mayor of the capital city, Indianapolis, convicted of violating the corrupt-practices act, was forced from office, along with a number of other Klan officials. The former Grand Dragon and the former Titan, together with an acting Grand Dragon, have been sent to the Federal Penitentiary for stealing automobiles. The Klan mayor of Evansville and his dragons have been voted out of office.

Like every other organization which at various times in our history has conducted a campaign of calumny against the Catholic Church, the Klan today stands discredited. But the spirit which formed it still lives. Catholics who think that they will henceforth escape all persecution, forget that they are members of a Church which throughout the ages has been persecuted. The A. P. A.

succeeds to the Know Nothings, the Klan to the A. P. A., and within a few years another group of grimy creatures will form a successor to the Klan.

But the Church still lives, and not only lives but flourishes, and daily marks some new advance in her battle for God's cause!

A Catholic Leader

AS philosophers have pointed out in every age, honors have a way of falling on the wrong heads. But there are exceptions. One was noted this week when Fordham University conferred the degree of Doctor of Laws upon Mrs. Thomas A. McGoldrick, of Brooklyn.

This lady may be characterized by saying that she is a Catholic who believes that religion is a thing to be lived, and to be fought for. That belief belongs to every Catholic. Unfortunately, however, in these days when compromise is the accepted policy of many, some Catholics live and act as though it were a tenet not, perhaps, heretical, but at least offensive to pious ears. What these compromisers really mean is that it is a principle which is offensive to non-Catholic ears.

In this, the compromisers are correct. It is a principle which contains as much of deadly offense as the Creed or an anathema of the Vatican Council. But just as every Catholic must subscribe to the Creed and accept the infallible decrees of a General Council, so too must he defend the position that his Faith is a thing to be lived, and to be fought for.

For the last decade, Mrs. McGoldrick has taken a leading part in every movement in the metropolis—and beyond it—for the furtherance of the cause of Christ the King. She has worked with Catholic and with non-Catholic associations, and because she never forgets that she is a Catholic, her efforts have won the respect and appreciation of all right-minded men and women. In the face of an unbelieving world, she has fearlessly presented the cause of Jesus Christ Crucified. She has pleaded for the children of God, exposed to the perils of an atheized education, and has found a place for them in the Catholic school. Acting in conjunction with national associations, she has striven to keep from the stage and the moving picture, representations of the vice that is fatally alluring to the young and inexperienced mind. She has appeared before State and Congressional committees to present the case for Christian morality and common decency against proposals to legalize practices which defile and destroy family and social life.

For her brave and often unpleasant work, Mrs. McGoldrick has not escaped criticism. The pity of it is that some of this criticism has come from Catholics who, apparently, labor under the delusion that the best way of defending the truth is to obscure it or to minimize it.

On this rock many a well-meaning apologist has met ruin. An apologist is not one who "apologizes" for the Faith, but who states without equivocation or reserve what that Faith is, and shows the grounds on which it rests. He explains, but he does not explain away. His speech is plain yea and nay. Liberalism is not freedom,

but the bondage to error that is inevitable when a principle of Catholic morality is compromised. And even should a minimizing system of apologetics stop short of this compromise, it is a defense that commonly leads to a surrender. Truth demands that we be ourselves, firm and outspoken, for on truth alone do we rely.

With the minimizers Mrs. McGoldrick has never been ranked. She does not assume to speak for the Church, but, as Msgr. Belford, of Brooklyn, has observed, she has always spoken with the Church. Many years ago, an exceedingly wise man wrote a set of rules for "Thinking with the Church." To some, these thoughts of St. Ignatius Loyola have ever been anathema, but they have been accepted in substance by the Saints and scholars who have been the Church's real apologists. Mrs. McGoldrick speaks with the Church because she thinks with the Church.

This Review, which glories in the name of Catholic and has never known any other title, congratulates Fordham. In conferring the doctorate upon Mrs. McGoldrick Fordham has enrolled among her children a woman whose works are worthy of public recognition. If we may end on a personal note, we also congratulate the wife and mother who from her own home and the five children who adorn it, draws inspiration, we are sure, to do whatever may be possible to make the world a place of Christian homes. A Catholic leader, Dr. McGoldrick is likewise a Catholic mother and a Catholic home-maker.

Shall We Abolish Intercollegiate Athletics?

THE high position in college affairs occupied by the athlete was set in clear light some weeks ago, when a State university in the Middle West was expelled from an athletic conference.

On June 4, the committee responsible for the expulsion met in Chicago to hear the university's defense. Even then an air of mystery surrounded the gathering. The committee dissolved, leaving in its wake a refusal to reconsider, and a set of questions directed to the governing board of the university. These interrogations, it may be supposed, give an indication of the reasons which had led to the expulsion.

In our judgment, these questions might well be examined, and answered in all honesty, by every institution whose students engage in intercollegiate athletic contests. (1) Can your school guard effectively the matter of scholarship eligibility? (2) Can it eliminate the subsidizing of athletes by funds of various kinds? (3) Can it restrain alumni activities, and maintain full faculty control? (4) Is the athletic department willing to disqualify all athletes, now in attendance, who have received improper financial aid?

In the full sense of the abused term, these questions may be called heart-searching. They strike directly at the root of evils which have the most degrading effect, not only upon the athletes whose standing is suspect, but upon the student body at large. Could they be answered in the affirmative, a fertile source of many abuses would be removed from many an American college.

Perhaps it is pessimistic to hold that they will never be honestly answered. But who will begin?

To admit young men to college, on a basis of brawn and not of brain, and then to pay them a salary for playing baseball or football, is a grotesque perversion of the very purpose of the college. The practice of thereafter certifying them on oath as bona fide students is plain perjury. Obviously, then, it is the duty of the administrative board, more specifically, of the president and the dean of the college, to bring this scandalous state of affairs to a speedy end.

But what president and what dean is capable of cleansing these Augean stables? It is not to be supposed that the faculty of the university which recently came to grief, had any inkling of an evil state of affairs. As men of honor and repute, they could not possibly have connived at lying and perjury. The mind of the committee is that serious abuses will continue, as long as the college authorities fail to exercise complete control of athletic contests. But here is the crux of the difficulty. How can the faculty stand out against the exceedingly clever work of the alumni?

We can formulate no definite answer. But stand out the faculty must, even should it become necessary to invoke the aid of the local police and of some sleepless detective agency. This, however, may be said. Many thoughtful alumni are fast coming to the conclusion that the only remedy is abolition of all intercollegiate contests.

If the stable cannot be cleaned, it must be destroyed. When the ruins are cleared away, we can take thought, and decide whether or not to rebuild. Athletic contests have no essential place in education, but no college deserves to live which compromises in the least degree the highest standards of truth and honor.

The Victory of the Labor Party

THE average British interpretation of a political battle in the United States invariably creases our placid brow. Occasionally, it causes us to wonder why it is that Britons, taking them by and large, still rank as intelligent beings.

Doubtless the average American interpretation of a British political conflict confirms the Briton in his belief that time used in reading anything that comes from the United States, is time lost.

We may be cousins, and some even think that we speak the same language. The Britons are not stupid, but both they and we usually lack the clue that gives understanding of a local political complication. What is clear at Muggleton may baffle Chicago, and what New Yorkers easily understand may reduce the finest intellect in Downing Street to a condition closely akin to imbecillity.

But we are unable to agree with those American editors who in the recent parliamentary elections find the sure beginning of needed social and economic reforms.

In England, as with us, labor has its grievances. Some of these can and should be removed by the State. The conviction that the Labor party was set to provide the

remedy, would cause us to rejoice; but we are not sure that the party knows what the remedy is, and it has yet to be demonstrated that the party deserves its name. Distortion can increase as the square of the distance, and England is more than three thousand miles to the east. Yet, as we see it, the Labor party has been no less averse to the game of partisan politics than the Liberals and the Conservatives. Although we have no Labor party in the United States, most candidates appeal to the laboring man, and come to him with both hands filled with promises. After the election, these pledges are conveniently forgotten. Old as the trick is, it frequently succeeds in winning votes. In this respect, human nature in Great Britain and in the United States is of a piece.

The Labor party entertains its full share of radicals, and radicals are quite commonly wedded to the belief that every social and economic evil yields at once to the reforming force of legislation. Were that belief correct, reform would be a comparatively easy matter, but man and his works and his errors constitute a problem not so readily solved. However, as a radical in power tends to become a conservative, we hope that the Labor party may adopt a policy which entitles it to be considered as the defender of the working man and of the common good. Careful consideration of the education question, and an effort to understand the need of religious instruction in the elementary schools, as suggested by Cardinal Bourne, are, as we view it, important features of that policy.

Volstead and Good Morals

THE fact that five States have either repealed their Prohibition statute, or from the first refused to enact one, will probably induce other States to turn enforcement back to the Federal Government. No State is under any obligation, constitutional or moral, to adopt legislation looking to the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment.

Wisconsin is the latest State to withdraw the cooperation which, by force of statute, it has thus far afforded the Federal Government. This withdrawal will not, presumably, greatly change the situation as it has existed in that State. It will, however, encourage other States whose citizens do not favor cooperation with Federal officials, to assert their independence.

In any case, neither total abstinence nor temperance has been properly promoted by the tremendous mass of statutes, State and Federal, and of rulings issued by the Treasury Department. Temperance of a desirable kind is secured only by free choice of the individual. It is for this reason that we have welcomed such movements as those of the Pioneers, in Ireland, and of various student organizations in this country.

To check the ominous growth of intemperance among the young, let us begin in our schools and colleges. The Bishop of Buffalo, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Turner, is reviving the practice of the voluntary pledge at the time of Confirmation. That practice will do more to promote good morals than all the statutes a dozen Congresses could inflict upon a long-suffering and disgusted public.

Catholic Action on the Air

MARK O. SHRIVER

AS a great many of us already know, English Catholics are busily carrying Catholic truth to the great non-Catholic majority. For nearly a dozen years, day after day, and night after night, in fair weather and in foul, speakers from the Catholic Evidence Guild have been preaching Catholic doctrine from "pitches" in Hyde Park in London, and on street corners in many other cities scattered through the United Kingdom, and the purpose, strange as it may sound at first blush, is not the actual conversion of those who come to listen. The Guilds operate wisely, and it is plain to be seen that a land and a people which have been Protestant for centuries cannot be won back to the Fold either overnight, or after a brief span of effort. The campaign continues not for outstanding and startling momentary success which might be but a flare-up, but as a foundation for work that will be carried on ten, twenty, fifty years from now when the present speakers shall all have passed away.

There is no such actively organized group in this country and persons who have given the matter thought have, it is said, felt that a similar campaign would be, for the present and under existing circumstances, inadvisable in our United States. And, yet, much effort has been expended and much time given in carrying Catholic truth to those who know it not. Catholic literature has been widely and thoroughly distributed by such agencies as the Georgia Laymen's Association and by many other scattered and less effective bodies operating somewhat haphazardly, and lacking any general concerted direction.

For instance, at a recent quarterly Holy Name meeting an unnamed member proposed in writing that Catholic literature—used Catholic literature, to keep the cost low—should be remailed to selected groups throughout the city and State. A list was to be taken from the registration books and, after the Catholic names had been eliminated, the rest were to be divided into sections and volunteers were to assume the responsibility of seeing that for a definite set period each person on the list received Catholic literature regularly. For three months, Mr. Jones would see that all families in the A, B, and C group were supplied, and, for another three months all those on the D, E, and F list and so, sooner or later, for brief periods, everyone would get something as to the truth of Catholic teaching, the actuality of Catholic belief and the facts of Catholic practice.

Such a scheme has many defects. Principally, it is neither continuous nor comprehensive, and there is no provision for a follow-up, a most glaring deficiency, for three months may expire just as one of the prospects is beginning to read his literature and is becoming susceptible. There is need for continuous work in dissipating antagonism arising from misunderstanding and from ignorance of what our Church really is.

The recent Presidential election made it plain that we have amongst us, as our English Catholics have amongst

them, thousands and hundreds of thousands utterly lacking in any knowledge of the Church. In the South, in Maryland, in New York even, Governor Smith unquestionably lost many votes because, and only because of that Faith in which, as he said, he tried to walk humbly with his God. It was no honest objection to him that changed those votes. Rather was it a vague and shivery fear based on misinformation and ignorance that begot prejudice and hatred. Hatred, perhaps, is not altogether the proper word, for the peculiar mental state is rather a childish dread of the unknown, of what might almost have seemed the unknowable, but an antipathy was clearly manifest. It need not be said that the Democrat was defeated because of his religion, probably no Democrat could have won, but it is not reasonably to be denied that millions of votes went to his opponent on what may well be called religious grounds. The point here is not that a Catholic candidate lost an election; it is that his defeat revealed a bitter antagonism towards his Faith.

Given, then, a situation, the question is as to the manner in which an untoward condition can best be remedied. Our Catholic distribution is most uneven. In New York, in Chicago, in Boston, in Pittsburgh, in Milwaukee, Catholics constitute a very considerable proportion of the population, while in such States as the Carolinas, Florida, Colorado and portions of Indiana and Michigan there are areas almost boundless where Catholics are rare. Catholics may indeed constitute a scant fifth of the total proportion but millions of Americans have grown to manhood and womanhood and never, knowingly, have spoken to one.

The task confronting our Catholic people is enormous. It is the instruction of non-Catholic Americans, almost a hundred million of them, not to convert, not to persuade, but to inform. Not only must the masses, many of them uneducated, be reached, but those as well who save for crass ignorance of all things Catholic, are otherwise held cultured and informed. The lack of knowledge of Catholicism among the students and professors in our large universities and smaller colleges is appalling and amazing, aye, incredible, until one takes the trouble to seek it out.

Of course, the Church is not especially harmed by attacks on her whether they come from ignorance or malice. As Mr. Benedict Elder once wrote in his "Plea for Peace," "in the face of assault she is silent. She has a right to be silent. When the frenzied Arab hurls his lance at the pyramid, the pyramid is silent." But while the Church may be silent, confident in her Divine destiny, individual Catholics cannot always hold their speech, and conditions today are not what they were fifteen and more years back. A duty rests on every Catholic man, woman and child, the duty of carrying forward the torch of learning, the light of information, the duty of sowing the seeds of knowledge.

Always, too, we must remember, as the English Guildsmen say, the danger that lies in rash endeavor to win an argument rather than the arguer, for it is with the arguer that we must always be the most concerned. There will be need of patience, everlasting patience, unflagging and inexhaustible, of carrying on without the stimulus of apparent result, of plodding and plugging and pushing for results that will be had only after years of effort in the days that are to come. The least bit of information lodged in an alien heart will work like leaven and if, in all the work, only one man learns one clear fact of doctrine the fact is never lost. Sooner or later it is passed on and then, with other facts, grouped or isolated, like the circles from a pebble dropped into a still lake, it reaches out spreading and stretching to limits undreamed of and unknown.

And a time has come when we should speak. Radio is a field strangely neglected by our Catholic people. We have our WLWL, the station of the Paulist League in New York, and WWL, the station of Loyola University, of New Orleans; WEW, of St. Louis University, and WHAD, of Marquette University, in Milwaukee, all in strong Catholic centers, and perhaps two more around the rest of the country, but radio has been sadly neglected.

According to a recent count made from a commercial log there are more than sixty professedly Protestant stations, not including many attached to Protestant colleges with seminary connections, while, including five Catholic colleges, there are but six real Catholic broadcasters, two of which are rated at only ten watts. In addition; WJAS in Pittsburgh every day, and KSL in Salt Lake and WHAS in Louisville broadcast Catholic services from time to time. Just how many other Protestant stations there are, such for example as the Fellowship Forum WJSV in Washington, operated under the initials of the owner in the name of a corporation, one may only surmise, but I have counted fifty-nine stations frankly operated by a church or by a religious organization. Of these, the Baptists control twelve, the Presbyterians five and eight other denominations one or more with the rest so listed that the religious affiliation cannot be established.

Besides there are the four great national Protestant broadcasts over the lanes of the N. B. C. and the two over the Columbia system. On Sunday afternoon when "Roxy and his gang" have left the air it is difficult to get anything except Protestant services, for many straight commercial lanes which hire out their facilities to all comers are similarly engaged. At 3:00 p. m. Dr. Poling and Rabbi Wise take the air, followed at 4:00 p. m. by Dr. Cadman and at 5:30 p. m. by the National Religious service, as it is called, though we are not supposed to have such a thing as a national religion, and at the same time the Cathedral Hour comes in from Washington over Columbia.

Of course, WLWL has its hour at 3:15 p. m. when the Forum is sent from Brooklyn by Columbus Council, and an hour and a quarter at 8:00 p. m. when they spread a sermon and Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament but most of the time WPG, with whom they share

the frequency, fills up the 273-meter lane. Unfortunately for many sections in the east, WLWL is badly placed on the dial and encounters much interference from wavelength neighbors and from what seems to this listener to be an inordinate amount of clicking code.

In the city of Baltimore with four stations, three regularly broadcast Protestant services morning, noon and night and so far as anyone knows, save for the Paulists, WHAS, WJAS and KSL are the only stations of any size that send out Catholic sermons or Catholic activities of any kind, and the time allotted to all of them together is woefully insufficient for our needs.

The Protestant churches have visualized the possibilities and have begun to utilize them to an amazing extent. Not only do very many own their stations so that they can use them freely save for the limitations imposed by the Radio Commission, but they retain commercial services in every section of the land.

Only the Catholics, apparently, have been asleep and have failed to grasp their opportunities. Now, with the presently existing long-term contracts it will be all but impossible to arrange satisfactory national hookups and we must do the best we can, and be content, for the time being, with local facilities. We have not been on the job and so must take the consequences of inaction and neglect. Along the whole seaboard on the east WLWL is the only Catholic broadcaster open to those who wish to listen to Catholic truth. The Protestant voice is loud in Newark, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, Washington and Richmond and on down the shore, but Catholics must be silent. Yet there are small stations still available which can be had for no very great expenditure, though their use involves much duplication and considerable waste of money but Catholic truth can be spread and Catholic truth should be spread. The radio can help us do it.

HELEN-OF-TOYS

Helen was such a little girl
With a blue bow in her hair!
I never go by her garden now
But I think I see her there.

I see her sweet eyes smiling there
The way they used to do
So many years and long ago,
Before she grew and grew.

Not that I love her still—not that—
And not that I really care—
But Helen was such a little girl
With a blue bow in her hair!

THOMAS BUTLER.

CONCEIT

If lovers could make summer, could make spring,
What delicate gifts at dawn, at evening
To tremulous sweethearts would all suitors bring!
And think how fine, how lover-like to say,
"Prithee, wilt take my posy, sweet? 'Tis May."
Or, "With my heart I bring thee June today."

Dearer than any light on land or sea
This thing has come to pass. Exquisitely
My Love is making April just for me!

SISTER M. MADEIRA.

What Catholics Think About

G. K. CHESTERTON

(Copyright, 1929)

I WAS looking the other day at a paper of the sort that is supposed to provide popular culture, and in this case rather especially what may be called popular science. In practice it largely provides what its supporters optimistically call Modern Thought and what we more commonly call Modernism.

It is, however, a paper by no means unfair or exclusive of the opposite point of view; it has more than once permitted me to reply to these views; and in looking at the issue in question, my eye was arrested by my own name. It occurred in an article on the religious doctrines of Mr. Arnold Bennett. Indeed, the prominence in the press of this name in this connection is one of the standing mysteries of modern journalism.

I have not only a great admiration for the artistic genius, but in many ways a strong liking for the human personality of Mr. Arnold Bennett. I like his liveliness and contempt for contempt. I like his humanity and merciful curiosity about everything human. I like that essential absence of snobbishness that enables him to sympathize even with snobs. But talking about the religious beliefs of Mr. Arnold Bennett seems to me exactly like talking about the fox-hunting adventures of Mr. Bernard Shaw or the favorite vintages of Mr. Pussyfoot Johnson or the celestial visions of Sir Arthur Keith or the monastic vows of Mr. Bertrand Russell.

But the matter of Mr. Arnold Bennett is, for the moment, a parenthesis. I mention it here merely because it was in the course of such an article that I found myself mentioned; and I confess I thought the reference a little odd. It will not surprise the reader to learn that the writer found me less Modernist than Mr. Arnold Bennett; that my religious beliefs did not present so pure and virgin and blameless a blank, but were defaced with definite statements about various things. But the writer professed to find something dubious or mysterious about my attitude; and what mystifies me is his mystification.

He delicately implied that there was more in me than met the eye; that I had that within, which passed all these Papistical shows, but that it was hopeless to vivisection me and discover the secret. He said: "Mr. Chesterton does not mean to enlighten us; for all we know he is Modernist enough in his own thoughts."

Now it would be thought a little annoying if an atheist were to say of some harmless Protestant Christian like General Booth: "For all we know, he is atheist enough in his own thoughts." We might even venture to inquire how the atheist could possibly form any notion of what General Booth thought, in such complete contradiction to everything he said. Or I myself, on the other hand, might seem less than grateful, if I were to suggest that Mr. Arnold Bennett must be concealing his conversion out of cowardice, and were to express it in the form: "Mr. Bennett will never tell us the truth about it; for all we know he is Papist enough in his own thoughts."

I might even be cross-examined about how I had come to form these suspicions about the secret thoughts of Mr. Arnold Bennett; as to whether I had hidden under his bed and heard him muttering Latin prayers in his dreams, or sent a private detective to verify the existence of his hairshirt and his concealed relics. It might be hinted that, until I could produce some such *prima facie* case for my suspicions, it would be more polite to suppose that the opinions of Mr. Bennett were what he himself said they were. And if I were sensitive on such things, I might make a rather sharp request, that people who cannot possibly know anything about me except what I say, should for the sake of our general convenience believe what I say.

On the subject of Modernism, as it happens, I had a strong intellectual contempt for it, even before I really believed in Catholicism. But I belong, as a biological product of evolution, to the order of the pachyderms, and I am not in the least moved by any annoyance in the matter; but only by a very strong mystification and curiosity about the real reason for this remarkable point of view. I know the writer did not mean any harm; but I am much more interested in trying to understand what he did mean. And the truth is, I think, that there is hidden in this curious and cryptic phrase the secret of the whole modern controversy about Catholicism.

What the man really meant was this: "Even poor old Chesterton must think; he can't have actually left off thinking altogether; there must be some form of cerebral function going forward to fill the empty hours of his misdirected and wasted life; and it is obvious that if a man begins to *think*, he can only think more or less in the direction of Modernism." The Modernists do really think that. That is the point. That is the joke.

Now what we have really got to hammer into the heads of all these people somehow is that a thinking man can think himself deeper and deeper into Catholicism, and not deeper and deeper into difficulties about Catholicism. We have got to make them see that conversion is the beginning of an active, fruitful, progressive and even adventurous life of the intellect. For *that* is the thing that they cannot at present bring themselves to believe.

They honestly say to themselves, "What can he be thinking about, if he is not thinking about the Mistakes of Moses, as discovered by Mr. Miggles, of Pudsey, or boldly defying all the terrors of the Inquisition which existed two hundred years ago in Spain?"

We have got to explain somehow that the great mysteries like the Blessed Trinity or the Blessed Sacrament are the starting-points for trains of thought far more stimulating, subtle and even individual, compared with which all that sceptical scratching is as thin, shallow and dusty as a nasty piece of scandal-mongering in a New England village.

Thus to accept the Logos as a truth is to be in the at-

mosphere of the absolute, not only with St. John the Evangelist, but with Plato and all the great mystics of the world. To accept the Logos as a "text" or an "interpolation" or a "development" or a dead word in a dead document, only used to give in rapid succession about six different dates to that document, is to be altogether on a lower plane of human life; to be squabbling and scratching for a merely negative success; even if it really were a success.

To exalt the Mass is to enter into a magnificent world of metaphysical ideas, illuminating all the relations of matter and mind, of flesh and spirit, of the most impersonal abstractions as well as the most personal affections. To set out merely to belittle and minimize the Mass, by talking ephemeral back-chat about what it had in common with Mithras or the Mysteries, is to be in altogether a more petty and pedantic mood; not only lower than Catholicism but lower even than Mithraism.

As I have said before, it is very difficult to say how we can best set about these things. We and our critics have come to talk in two different languages; so that the very names by which we describe the things inside stand for totally different things in the absurd labels they have stuck upon the wall outside. Often if we said the great things we have to say, they would sound like the small things they accuse us of saying.

A philosophical process can only begin at the right end; and they have got hold of everything by the wrong end. But I am myself disposed to think that we should begin by challenging one very common phrase or form of words; a thing that has become a catchword and a caption, or in the ordinary popular phrase, a headline. Because the journalists incessantly repeat it, and draw attention to it by repeating it, we may possibly draw attention by denying it.

When the journalist says for the thousandth time, "Living religion is not in dull and dusty dogmas, etc.," we must stop him with a sort of shout and say, "There—you go wrong at the very start." If he would condescend to ask what the dogmas are, he would find out that it is precisely the dogmas that are living, that are inspiring, that are intellectually interesting.

Zeal and charity and unction are admirable as flowers and fruit; but if you are really interested in the living principle you must be interested in the root or the seed. In other words, you must be intelligently interested in the statement with which the whole thing started; even if it is only to deny it.

Even if the critic cannot come to agree with the Catholic, he can come to see that it is certain ideas about the universe that make him a Catholic. He can see that being cosmic in that way, and Catholic in that way, is what makes him different from other people; and what makes him, at the very least, a not uninteresting figure in human history.

He will never get anywhere near it by sentimentalizing against Catholic sentiment or pontificating against Catholic pontiffs. He must get hold of the ideas as ideas; and he will find that the most interesting of all the ideas are those which the newspapers dismiss as dogmas.

On Lady Abbesses and Indeflectibility

WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S.J.

I HAVE always wondered why the gentry that investigate so industriously the teaching of morality have never turned their guns on the Catholic parish schools. Here is a definite program in character training, an age-old tradition in religious teaching. Might not these wise men from the East and the West who are trying to construct character curricula and formulating a technique for teaching morality—and nice fat prizes given for the same, although the deadly system of rewards, invented by the terrible Jesuits, is sniffed at with elevated lorgnette by our modern schoolma'ams—might they not, I ask, find perhaps a few antique shards in the Catholic system that they could thoroughly fumigate of Papist incense and mend with evangelical glue?

I proposed this question once to a learned educationist—it is the *mot juste*, I assure you; educator is quite out of fashion—and he assured me there was nothing to learn because, of course, Catholics inject the mythical or mystical element of dogma into their programs of religious education. And there you are.

Fancy the joy that came to me, who am condemned for my sins to read most of the bilge that comes from the educational presses each month, when I found in the issue of *School and Society* for May 11, a leading article entitled "The Religious Curriculum of the Roman Catholic Elementary Schools," by Robert E. O'Brien. At last, Catholics are getting recognition, thought I. And then the name O'Brien met my eye and I recalled that a gentleman of that name whose name appears occasionally in the journals devoted to religious education is a Protestant minister at Blue Island, one of the banlieus of Chicago. He belongs to the tribe of scientific educationists. An aura of objectivity hangs about him. In the present investigation, for example, he counted the number of religious pictures in each school and got the median for the group; he inspected the statues before which the children worshipped—he was sure they worshipped because votive lamps were burning before them—and found out whether they were life size or only twenty inches. And imagine the delight to his evangelical soul when he found such evidences of Romish superstition as holy water stoups in the classroom—each with a sponge to prevent too frequent evaporation and located at a height for the children to be able to reach it! The craftiness of Rome! The educational world is under a heavy contribution to Mr. O'Brien for having extended the horizons that limit our knowledge of these benighted Papists. If he had only thought to measure the frills in the different variety of Sisters' bonnets that he encountered on his quest, he would deserve, at the least, a Pulitzer prize.

But naturally, Mr. O'Brien did not stop at the mere externals of Catholic worship. He wanted to penetrate to the inner spirit that animated it. He made some astonishing discoveries. For example, he announces that "ritualistic instruction [whatever that may be] is limited to teaching the pupil how to enter and act in church," but contradicts himself in the same paragraph when he tells

how the children are shown how to participate in the life of the Church by assisting at Mass, and by receiving the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist. Further on, the astounding statement is made that "Confirmation makes the child a member of the Church, entitled to all its rights and privileges." Somehow we were under the impression that Baptism was the Sacrament of initiation, and that it was so acknowledged not merely in the unwavering tradition of the Church but also by all the sects that admit anything like a sacramental system.

A more startling disclosure is made later on. I quote verbatim (italics are mine): "Since confirmation permits the pupil to assist in the *administration of the Sacraments*, he should be instructed in the manner in which they are prepared and how to assist in them." It will be a shock to the Pope to learn that the American Church has thrown off the shackles of priestcraft and admitted even young children to the administration of the Sacraments. Now, if Mr. O'Brien had spent a little time on the Baltimore Catechism, No. II, that he talks about so glibly, he might have avoided these and other preposterous errors. I pass over the ludicrous phraseology, in his narrative of Catholic (?) practice, such as, "receive the holy wafer," "take the Sacraments," "give thanksgiving for them," and the like. If a man were writing a scientific report on the religious practice of the Hopi Indians, he would be obliged to make an earnest effort to represent the beliefs of the poor savages as they are, even though he might legitimately indulge now and then in a paragraph of moralizing, urging his readers not to take part in such pagan practices.

But the most exquisitely delicious error is where the author tells how the children are instructed on the Church's "indefectibility." What a lovely word! Surely the "indefectible" Church owes the gentleman a profound debt of gratitude for it. Later, to substantiate his statement that "every effort is made to develop Catholic loyalties *even at the expense of tolerance*," he cites the instruction of the Archdiocesan School Board to the parish-school teachers in its religion syllabus: "We do not teach that all Protestants go to hell. If they live up to their religion and are in good faith they will be saved." I wonder if the Methsadist Sunday school is as generous in theory and practice.

He is not content with merely quoting from a school syllabus, however; characters are introduced into his text to impart the quality of drama to his narrative. Thus, a good Sister is quoted to the effect that lay teachers could not teach "religion as well as we for they do not wear the habit which is *part of our religion*." I wonder if Mr. O'Brien will find out for us what part of our religion the wearing of a habit is. If it is, we shall all have to get busy, for most of us have been woefully negligent in the matter. And I wonder if we will be given a choice as to which habit we must wear in order to save our souls. But the most interesting figure that stalks across his pages is the vigorous Superior who disapproved of Mass—in small letters—for children. This lady abbess who was "in charge of one of the best schools visited, felt that mass (again small letters) served no real purpose." Mass had

been discontinued in her school and she "vigorously defended its abolishment. When asked for her viewpoint she exclaimed, 'What's the use of it anyhow? There's young C—— (a young man who recently had confessed to a brutal murder). He attended here until he graduated and never missed a single mass. Now look at him! Why the boys say he attended mass the morning after the murder. Just think of it! The morning after the murder! No, sir! We have no more masses for children. They are just a plain waste of time.'"

This hypothetical nun uses most admirable logic. And it receives the smug approbation of Mr. O'Brien. I hope that Mr. O'Brien will put the lesson into effect with his own little flock. Because religion failed to "take" with poor C—— (a pervert, and pronounced a moron by psychiatrists of national reputation at his trial) therefore we must close the parish schools, or at least abolish all religious practices. *Argal*, when a Methodist person runs away with the leader of his choir, we shall sell the Methodist churches to the gentry that conduct speak-easies. Every time a Baptist Sunday-school teacher absconds with church funds, the Baptist Board of something or other will be forced to padlock all Baptist Sunday schools. What delicious possibilities there are in the lady abbess's logic.

But we need not pursue the subject further. Catholics have a sense of humor, and the only reason we cannot accuse this Reverend Mother of talking through her fluted bonnet is that there never was any reverend mother outside of the Reverend O'Brien's own head. That a supposedly scientific article would print in quotation marks such a statement as emanating from a Catholic nun is ludicrous and stupid.

The sad thing is that a reputable journal, such as *School and Society* has always been, should publish such balderdash. Every Catholic knows that no Sister, not even a lady abbess, would be able to "abolish" the Mass even in the sense that Mr. O'Brien probably means, although his clarity of expression leaves much to be desired. The pastor is always the director of the school. He would be the one to decide whether daily Mass should be obligatory for the school children or optional. Every Catholic knows that no priest or nun would discourage children from coming to Mass even though it meant considerable self-sacrifice.

Mr. O'Brien may not know it, but the Christian religion is built on the idea of sacrifice and for the Catholic, "it is the Mass alone that matters." This despite the Maria-Monkish nun of Mr. O'Brien that thinks it just a waste of time. Of course, the conclusive reason for questioning the authenticity of the above quotation is that our nuns are ladies; they don't talk like fish-wives—no, sir!—as the imaginary lady abbess of Mr. O'Brien unquestionably does.

Something ought to be done about this. Can't we have a law for suppressing the emergence of the Great American Ass into print? Or cannot editors demand that their contributors submit a sworn statement concerning their I. Q. before accepting any of their articles? Poor Mr. O'Brien! I wonder where he got the name.

Shall We Repeal the Censorship Law?

JAMES GARRETT WALLACE

LAST week, writing on the subject of censorship, I explained the purpose and scope of the laws on censorship and their relation to free speech. These laws, of course, are criticized, but to the critics of the present law, I have a right to say: What do you propose to substitute for it?

Preliminary censorship is legally impossible, and, in my opinion, highly undesirable. It is effective, of course, in suppressing that which the censor does not wish to be published, but it is utterly at variance with the fundamental principles upon which this government is founded. In my opinion, to empower a government official to decide in advance what should or should not be published would be to create an intolerable tyranny. No matter who the censor might be, he would bring to the task his own prejudices—unrestrained by legal standards and legal processes—and in the final analysis, the test of the legality of a publication would be "Does the censor like it?"

While some well-meaning people might think that it would be a splendid thing to prevent the publication of indecent and immoral writings before sale and distribution, particularly the sort that would be almost universally so regarded, still experience has taught us that government censors become political censors, and that they are easily diverted from the object which originally caused their creation. They invariably seek for an extension of their arbitrary powers and try to curtail and restrict activities not even under consideration at the time the censorship power was created.

But, while under our Constitution, preliminary censorship is neither possible nor desirable, we are not compelled to go to the other extreme and throw ourselves into the arms of those who believe in the doctrine of no responsibility to the individual, no matter how offensive, obscene or indecent his writings may be.

While our courts have held that all the agencies of government combined cannot abridge the freedom of speech or of the press, the legislature may control and the courts may punish the licentiousness of the press. In other words, the law does not say, "Publish and be free," or "Publish and be damned," but it does say "Publish and be responsible." It seems to me that there can be no just complaint against that.

Law is not a panacea for the ills of humanity; it is not a universal cure-all, nor is this a perfect answer to the evils incident to the right to publish freely one's sentiments. But properly enforced it results in an approximation of justice and that is all that one can expect in this world. People who are impatient with governmental methods ought to bear this in mind.

The claim is made that such laws are unjust because they are indefinite, do not clearly specify that which is obscene or indecent, and because there is no definition of obscenity that is universally accepted as correct.

Of course, there is and must be a certain indefiniteness in such statutes, as, in fact, there is in every law. Laws are necessarily couched in general terms. The very people who protest against the indefiniteness of these laws would cry out most bitterly if the statutes specified certain words, phrases, and subjects as being obscene and indecent and tabooed them. They would claim, with some justice, that the surrounding circumstances and conditions, the manner in which the subject was handled, the medium in which the writings were circulated, and many other things, might have a bearing on the question of its obscenity.

If a statute is general in its terms, it is the duty of the court to interpret it, and by judicial legislation to fix its boundaries more definitely. The words, *obscene* and *indecent*, are no more indefinite, and their meaning is no more obscure than the words *reasonable doubt*, which are used in every criminal case, or the phrase, "a fair preponderance of the credible evidence," which is used in every civil suit.

"What is obscenity—What is indecency?" ask the lawyer critics of this law. Well, what is a reasonable doubt? The judge charges the jury that it is a doubt for which a reason may be given, arising from the evidence, or the lack of it—a doubt which a reasonable man may entertain after a careful and honest review of the evidence, a doubt which leaves a juror's mind in such a state that he cannot say that he is convinced, to a moral certainty, of the guilt of the defendant. Again, what is a moral certainty? What is a reasonable man? Against all of these words and phrases, the charge of indefiniteness can be brought.

What seems reasonable to one mind may well seem unreasonable to another. We have no mathematical formula for working out and always arriving at an accurate result in our system of law and procedure. Nevertheless, we must have a standard to set up for the guidance of a jury, and though it may be, and in the very nature of things, must be, somewhat indefinite, that fact does not condemn the standard, nor can its critics suggest a better one.

In the application of the libel laws, which are analogous to the statute under discussion, the "indefiniteness" may be found. A person may freely publish criticisms of another, even defamatory matter. But, if in publishing an article, critical of another, one writes or prints that which a court or jury thereafter determines to be libelous, then the person responsible for the publication may be mulcted in damages, or fined and imprisoned for committing the crime of criminal libel. One cannot invariably determine in advance what may or may not be considered libelous by a court or jury. There is here, therefore, that same "indefiniteness," the same possibility of inconsistency in the application of a standard depending somewhat upon the persons applying it. Nevertheless, the law

is a good and a necessary one, and its repeal would make for greater evil than now results from any defects in the law, or from any inconsistencies in its enforcement.

The law must assume in the average citizen a certain degree of intelligence and a certain knowledge of the common standards of good morals and good behavior. It must assume that he is familiar with the ordinary meaning of words in everyday use. It must even make the rash assumption that there is such a thing as right and wrong, and that the citizen knows the difference between them. It assumes that he knows the law, hence the maxim that ignorance of the law excuses no man; even lawyers and judges are presumed to know the law. We must also assume that a citizen knowing the law will endeavor to obey it and not try to circumvent it.

It has been said there is a twilight zone that lies between the palpably pornographic and the obviously innocuous, and that this statute inflicts great hardship upon those adventurous spirits who wish to explore this enchanted realm. Obviously, border-line cases may arise in the enforcement of any law. Those who desire to trifle with the conventions of organized society, those who deliberately seek to break the bounds which the community has set to restrict the publication of indecent matter, those who are determined to thrust their ideas down the throat of an unwilling majority, are, of course, very apt to slip from the twilight zone over the border into the land of criminal obscenity. They do this with the full knowledge of the risk which they are taking and should blame no one but themselves if the consequences are unpleasant.

The object of this statute is to protect the public morals, especially the morals of the young and immature, from the evil influence of obscene publications. I know that there are those who claim that no one was ever injured or that there is no proof that anyone was ever injured by an obscene or indecent publication. They are given the lie by our whole system of education. Centuries of experience have convinced educators, who are wholeheartedly devoted to the improvement of mankind, that the youthful mind and character is developed along sound lines by bringing it in contact with that which is noble and uplifting, and by keeping it from contact with that which is low, base and vile.

We are now told by certain people, few in number but loud in utterance, that this theory of education is wrong, and that the way to educate the young is to expose them to all sorts of vicious conditions and to familiarize them with sordid and nasty practices, so that they will not be ignorant of what these people call LIFE. Nevertheless, sensible parents and guardians do not send their charges into pestholes for the purpose of immunizing them from disease. They rather seek to avoid the centers of infection. The vast majority of people know that the free circulation of obscene and indecent literature must necessarily result in the lowering of the moral standards of the community.

The object of this law is to protect those moral standards and to punish those who seek to tear them down. The intent of the law is to make the community the final

arbiter as to whether or not an offense has been committed. The Federal Court in the case of the United States vs. Harmon, said: "What is the judgment of the aggregate sense of the community reached by the publication? What is the probable, reasonable effect on the sense of decency, purity and chastity of society, extending to the family, made up of men and women, young boys and girls—the family which is the common nursery of mankind, the foundation rock upon which the State reposes?"

Under the law, therefore, the decision as to whether or not a publication is improper rests in the final analysis with a court and jury created by and in the community in which the publication is issued.

What just complaint can an individual have if the community through its agencies condemns his publication as a violation of the law? Is he justified in believing that the community is wrong and he is right? If that is his opinion, perhaps he is in that class of persons who are unable to adjust themselves to their environment. Does he claim that the moral standard of the community differs from his? Then, may not the fault be his rather than the community's? Does he claim that he committed wrong unknowingly? That may merely demonstrate his egregious ignorance. If he believes that everyone else in the community is wrong and that he is right, does he expect for that reason, to be permitted to enforce his will upon the majority?

So far as the law and its enforcement in the State of New York are concerned, it seems to me that authors and publishers have little to complain of. They have, in fact, a degree of liberty far greater than they have been able wisely to employ. I know of no meritorious literary work that has been condemned under the law in this State. I know of no literary work of merit the publication of which has been prevented by this law.

The trouble with the publishing business in this community is not a lack of liberty to publish, but a dearth of worthy literary material. With the multiplication of publishing plants, with book clubs, and other agencies creating an increased market for books, it has become too easy to obtain publication for all sorts of meretricious trash. The liberty for which some persons so loudly clamor has been used mainly for publishing piffle.

If any man has a message that is vital, there is no law on our statute books that will prevent him from being heard.

HOPE

Since one I loved put all his toys away,
And went forth smiling from the narrow room
We call the world, to find beyond our gloom
The Face that children's angels in their play
Look on forever—not once, since that day
Have I seen ugliness in any tomb;
Only the little door of all men's doom,
Through which our happy dead have marked the way.

O death, kind friend, I see your image now
In all men's eyes, in every form and face:
In this young girl, so lithe, so beautiful,
A skeleton draped in a moment's grace—
And on that great man's grave and handsome brow
The hollow patient wisdom of a skull.

WILLIAM THOMAS WALSH.

Sociology**Capital Punishment**

ROBERT E. SHORTALL

AT the present time there is much alleged "earnest searching of minds" with regard to the question of capital punishment. Newspapers and magazines are publishing statements by numerous persons who argue vehemently that capital punishment should be abolished. I am frank to confess that I should like to find some good reason why it should be abolished. But does one such reason exist?

The average man, to save his own life, would not hesitate to kill his assailant. Against the threat of vicious murder, the State opposes the threat of capital punishment. However, in the vast majority of cases where the murderer has made good his threat, the State finds its sword arm hopelessly entangled in a mass of legal procedure. The fact that a law is duly written in the statute books, is no proof that the law is enforced. We now live in an age when many people place their faith in statute books, and the rest of the people place their faith in "bootleggers." The result is the disorder against which a dozen investigating boards are now struggling.

But to return to the question of capital punishment. I make no attempt here to set forth the case for capital punishment. In fact, I am honestly looking for a good reason why it should be abolished. Right before me is a newspaper account of an interview given by Mr. Justice Townsend Scudder, a Judge of great learning and experience, held in high esteem by the entire legal profession. Opposed to capital punishment, he is reported to have said:

I am opposed to capital punishment because I do not believe it offers any remedy for murder and because I think it degrades a court of justice to turn it into a charnel house. The processes of justice should be above all things dignified and elevating and I cannot believe that the sentencing of a man or woman to death can be either.

Crime, including murder, springs from uncontrolled appetites. You cannot set right the uncontrolled desire for something by killing the owner of the appetite after it has betrayed him into crime. The time to cure the wrong desire is when it is born and that is in the home and not in the courts of law.

I don't care how delightful prison may have become. There is still this terrible drawback to it—you are not free to do what you want or go where you please. All the material comforts in the world cannot compensate for or take away the horror of being confined and shut up. Any person knows that if he will be honest with himself. It is to me far more terrible to think of being locked up from society for life than to know that I was to die.

In these statements, Judge Scudder has combined in concise, emphatic language the three stock arguments which are the basis of almost all opinions against capital punishment. Summed up, his arguments against capital punishment are:

1. It is not a remedy because it is applied after the crime.

2. It is not dignified and elevating, but is degrading.

3. Life imprisonment is more terrible and horrible.

The error of the first argument lies in this, that it takes

so narrow a view that it excludes all considerations except the particular predicament of a particular murderer caught in the toils of the law. Our sympathy is almost bound to go out to any unfortunate so situated. Hence we sometimes forget the horror of his terrible crime. Moreover, we are secretly thankful that the Almighty has spared us such temptation as that to which the unfortunate succumbed. Of course, the execution of that particular murderer is not for the purpose of reforming him as a citizen. His case is finished. But capital punishment is not entirely a question of balancing the scales of justice. We must also consider those persons among us who are contemplating, or might contemplate, committing murder. To borrow the learned Judge's own words, "The time to cure the wrong desire is when it is born." The certainty of sure, speedy, and adequate punishment is a great deterrent of wrong desires. We all know that if we touch the third rail in the subway, certain natural laws will immediately operate, and destroy us. But we are not sure, when a man commits murder, that the State laws will immediately operate. Laws that are not enforced afford no protection to society. In fact, the vicious elements in the community are encouraged in their crimes by the laxity of law enforcement. By vigorous law enforcement, the State makes dread examples of the condemned for the protection of the community. By non-enforcement the State makes a sorry example of itself as incapable of protecting the community.

The second argument, that capital punishment is not dignified and elevating, that "it degrades a court of justice to turn it into a charnel house," discloses the real reason why many people object to capital punishment. The first argument is based on a narrow mental viewpoint, but the second argument on emotional feelings of men who shrink from the contemplation of unpleasant duties. Killing, however justified, is always repulsive, whether it is done in war among nations, in the war by society on its vicious element, or in self-defense by an individual citizen. But no man would feel that he was turning his home into a charnel house, or degrading it, should he kill an intruder in order to save the lives of his children. Life is full of unpleasant duties. In the operating rooms of the hospital, limbs are cut off, bodies cut open, cancers and tumors cut out, under necessary circumstances that would horrify the ordinary citizen. We must be thankful for doctors and nurses who have steady nerves, and whose emotional condition does not make them shrink from unpleasant duties. Like the learned Judge, most of us would prefer to turn our attention only to such duties as are "dignified and elevating," but there is a danger that yielding to an emotional condition may unfit us on occasions for some of life's unpleasant, but necessary duties.

The third argument is that life imprisonment is more terrible and horrible than capital punishment, and that criminals are more afraid of life imprisonment than they are of death. That argument is now a classic, and I am surprised that the learned Judge seriously advances it. In my humble estimation, no man can make that argu-

ment and survive as a serious opponent of capital punishment. If life imprisonment is more terrible and horrible than capital punishment, please explain why we must substitute this more terrible and horrible punishment? Why make the punishment so terrible and horrible that the condemned would rather die? What is left of the argument that we should not apply the remedy *after* the crime? Nothing! What is left of the argument that we should not be cruel, but only dignified and elevating? Nothing! It is the worst refinement of cruelty to punish a man so terribly and horribly that at last he begs to be allowed to die.

In all seriousness is not the learned judge's argument to be summed up as follows: Let the State treat murderers with such cruelty that they would rather die, but don't let them die, because that would make us outsiders feel unpleasant."

Education

Let's Prepare Our Teachers!

CRICKET WAINSCOTT

AT the tender age of six, I was discovered well nigh dissolved in tears, with an affecting page in "David Copperfield" clasped to my bosom. Perhaps you can remember how when poor little ill-used David was leaving with Mr. Barkis to go away to boarding school, he turned and saw his mother standing in the doorway with her baby in her arms? It was the last time he saw her . . . Upon my word, Sir, if that passage does not make you fumble for your handkerchief—why, you have no heart, but a mere muscle; nay, a piece of flint, in that broad thorax of yours.

Since that long distant day I have reveled in much pathos. With Missus Gummidge, I am an apt subject, for I feel it more than others. But I broke down badly this morning when I read Mr. John Wiltbye's Sad Tale of an Old Professor (AMERICA, June 1) who, for lack of a degree, fell down while trying to climb into the Chair of Romance Languages. Recovering sufficiently to wipe away the flowing tears, however, I began to inquire whether I had not been subjected to a large dose of bathos with which not a trace of pathos, fire-tested and true, was mingled.

Now, from my point of view (which, of course, is wholly correct) this tottering scholar should thank whatever stars presided over his nativity. A teacher who turns with nightly hand the pages of Aeschylus and Vergil, whose French won the praise of Baudrillart, would sit most uneasily in any such chair in any American college. The unlicked cubs that prowl about its rungs would break his honest heart in a week. They are not interested in literature or culture. The best of them are saving up credits to exchange, like trading stamps, for a degree. As for the others, heaven alone knows what keeps them at college.

Let us, then, give thanks that this old gentleman was saved from a direful fate. With all my heart I wish him an easy chair and a pipe, on the sunny side of a

wall, where his Vergilian bees hum amid the honeyed peaches. As the music of the *aquae salientes* lull him to sleep, there we may leave him, a pathetic old figure, a scholar for whom no American school can find a place and keep its name on the List of Approved Colleges.

Paying this tribute, I turn back to reality.

It is quite true that all standardizing bodies require holders of chairs and department heads to submit evidence of professional training and scholarly achievement. I admit that "scholarly achievement" is usually interpreted in a broad sense, and few will maintain that the average successful candidate for the doctorate adds anything "new" to the sum of human knowledge. I don't know who has done that since Newton.

But new and valuable ways of applying known principles are frequently discovered by these young scholars, and many of them evince ability for independent investigation. There are fools among them, as among all classes of men, learned and illiterate; but the fundamental reason why most of them take care of their health is not the conviction that all learning would die with them.

And, finally—although my contention may strain Mr. Wiltbye's credulity—not a few of them are excellent teachers. While I do not ask him to break into lusty cheering at sight of a new-fledged Ph.D., will he not refrain from condemnation until he has examined the sample's pin-feathers?

Let me add a few more concessions.

The standardizing bodies exercise no legal authority whatever, and the rules which they promulgate are wholly void of legal force. Theoretically, any college may disregard them. Practically, every college is forced to submit to them. The situation, as it now is, and is likely to be for some time, is simply this: the power to set standards is exercised by associations which have no legal or moral right to set, much less to enforce, any standard at all.

Whether we think this a desirable state of affairs or not—and I, for one, think it at least highly questionable—the fact is that it is accepted and approved by a majority of our American colleges. It is also accepted by the best medical, law, and scientific schools, which limit admission to students from the standardized colleges.

The question, then, before the Catholic college is not whether it can successfully oppose the North Central or any similar regional group. *It cannot.* That question was settled years ago. The real question, as distinguished from polemical treatises on theoretical rights and wrongs, is simply this: can the Catholic college accept the situation as it actually is, without in any manner compromising the principles which are the sole reason for its existence?

I submit that this question can be answered in the affirmative. I go beyond this, and say that, in my judgment, the college which does not answer in this sense is doomed to speedy extinction. Standardization has a firm seat in the saddle. Some David with a sling may arise, but his head has not yet pushed above the horizon. Possibly, like Mussolini's promised successor, he has not yet been born.

It is loss of time to sit idly by, speculating on what may happen. The crisis calls for immediate action, designed to prevent what *has* happened from happening again. It is imperative that our educational authorities at once select promising young students (not old men who should be making their souls) and encourage them to work for advanced degrees. These young men and women should be given ample time and the proper environment. It is taken for granted that the man who has serious difficulties with the multiplication table will not be told off to work in higher mathematics, and that his brother who lisped in figures will not be required to do research work in literature. But if a student of balanced common sense is afforded the opportunity of years of study in his chosen field, he will not only end as a master of his subject, but, in all probability, as a good teacher. I decline to admit that of itself knowledge atrophies the power to teach. Should the candidate lack balance and common sense, then he is out of place in any classroom, kindergarten or university, and should be advised to seek some other occupation.

St. Ignatius, I believe, bade the members of the Society learn and use the language of the country in which they lived. A wise regulation, this, and it has its bearing on the question raised by Mr. Wiltbye. Time was when the ordinary training imparted in a teaching community or a diocesan normal school sufficed to form an acceptable teacher. Today the world of education is talking another language.

Much of it is nonsense, I grant, but some of it is sober wisdom. It is wise to allow a gifted student liberal opportunities to perfect himself in the subject in which he excels. That, in substance, is the purpose of the extended study and research which precede the conferring of the doctorate. It is wise to conform, always keeping our principles intact, to the customs of the country in which we live. And it is the climax of folly to cling to old ideas and old methods, when this mistaken loyalty imperils the very existence of a needed work. I think I am not wrong when I say that every founder of a teaching community was not only an educational reformer—taking the word in its best sense—but so far ahead of the age that he or she was regarded with suspicion by the ultra-orthodox. These pioneers never made the mistake of turning a means into an end.

Instead, then, of bickering with the standardizing agencies over technicalities (which is merely so much lost time) let us prepare our teachers to become real masters acquainted with all the lore of Egypt. If in the course of their work, they acquire degrees which make them acceptable to the regional standardizing agency, all the better.

For without teachers so trained, the Catholic college cannot long maintain the battle. Surely, it is not fair to ask our young people to come to us, when all that we can give them is a degree which the best professional schools decline to recognize. How long can we hold them, if we persist in the policy of flouting the reasonable requirements of the standardizing associations?

Indeed, are we justified in holding them at all?

With Scrip and Staff

THE following letter was received recently from a prominent business man and well-known Catholic layman:

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Within the last two years or more there seems to have been an increasing activity in a certain direction which to me is very disturbing and which I am afraid is leading to abuse and may possibly result in a serious situation. I can best make clear my meaning by stating my most recent experience.

About two months ago I had the misfortune of losing a son grown to manhood, whose death was noted in the press, including some Catholic publications. Within a week I received four or five appeals for money, partly from institutions and partly from individual churches, with all of which were combined statements of many Masses and Indulgences. It may be that under the circumstances my judgment was not as clear as it should be, but I felt distinctly repelled by what smacked of pure commercialism, and I am just wondering if it isn't time for higher authority to curb these activities, or draw some clear-cut line beyond which this thing must stop.

As a Catholic of the average intelligence and education, I understand fully both the theory and the practice of Mass offerings and consider it a very estimable thing. I am one of those who believe in offerings of that kind being infinitely more acceptable than flowers and all-in-all am in full accord with what I believe to be the doctrine of the Church in these matters.

However, I cannot shake off the feeling from this experience and others in previous years when my name appeared in certain Catholic organization directories, that the matter has gone too far. If I were not a Catholic and got hold of some of the literature that has come to me, I should certainly feel that simony was flourishing. We have enough to combat in the way of charges based on ignorance or misunderstanding without furnishing what seems to be good evidence in respect to these matters. Poor churches and missions and institutions must be supported by us and of course the only return most of them can make is by their prayers for their benefactors, but unless I am absolutely mistaken, some of this modern activity that I have referred to has gone far beyond the bounds of Catholic charity.

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

The writer may state what some others have felt, but hesitated to express.

THAT appeals based on an absolute *quid-pro-quo*, offering Masses or other spiritual benefits in direct exchange for contributions, are ruled out by the nature of the case, is evident. Even where the exchange is not so direct as to be positively unlawful, the misunderstandings and scandal therefrom ensuing are enough to prohibit the practice. However, it is not such cases that the writer appears to have in mind, but rather promised expressions of gratitude which, by their explicitness and detailed enumeration, give an *impression* of bargaining the spiritual for the temporal, even though the temporal be a most worthy cause.

Such instances, it seems to me, are largely matters of degree and taste. No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down, unless the practice were to get out of all bounds. It is not only lawful, but most fitting, as the writer implies, that poor churches and missions and institutions should make the only return they can make, which is that of prayers for their benefactors. Good sense and tact, however, will find a way to express such a promise as not only not to offend, but to elevate and give comfort and joy

to benefactors. On the other hand, a touch of crudeness in such matters—even if well-meant—can produce only disgust.

Many welcome, too, and should welcome, the opportunity for the founding of Masses, especially when thereby they can provide for the soul of a deceased member of the family or friend, and, at the same time, assist some worthy cause. But, here again, the presentation of such an opportunity to the general public calls for the greatest tact and a complete absence of not only actually grasping, but even of the appearance of grasping for "returns," which, in point of fact, is far from easy to reconcile with the intense anxiety for elementary material needs that many of our charitable and missionary works are obliged to feel. Hence wise supervision, at least, is needed for appeals which incorporate any such features.

With all these provisos in mind, however, it seems absolutely unfitting—no matter what may be their merit or nature—that appeals be sent on the occasion of a recent bereavement, such as the writer described. Even if there were the best intention of offering comfort, even if correctly and tactfully put, regard for the fitness of things ought to rule out such a practice. The mere fact that the writer received four or five such appeals in a week's time, shows that crude thoughtlessness had somehow taken the place of real concern for the consolation or spiritual aid of a sorrowing parent.

SOME forms of appealing, anyway, would be less necessary if more union and encouragement could be obtained for well-thought-out methods of support for charitable enterprises. Rigid systematization and extreme unification are not practicable, nor even desirable, in view of the free play for the human and the personal which is proper to Catholic charity; yet often a moderate amount of method can save much waste effort.

The development of the Dollar-a-Sunday plan has been an illustration of this. Frank M. Sullivan, a retired banker of Seattle, told recently in the *Los Angeles Tidings* how he came to start the "Dollar-a-Sunday Club" in Seattle.

It was in endeavoring to help a debt-ridden parish on its feet financially that I came upon the idea of the Dollar-a-Sunday Club. . . . In order to do something to keep the church from disaster, I started a club known as the \$10-a-Month Club. . . . Later on, in the same parish, I formed a \$5-a-Month Club, gathering together 125 members. . . . It came to my mind that a Dollar-a-Sunday Club, with envelopes distributed, would be as good as the \$5-a-Month Club. . . . The response was instant and generous and beyond the expectations of anyone. . . .

The Church was at once adequately financed and with the co-operation of the people, the pastor, whose ability was undoubted, virtually wiped out the debt in six years—and this income is still continuing today for expansion, and for school and charity.

This was the beginning of what is now nationally known as the Dollar-a-Sunday Club. A dollar for those who can—50 cents or 25 cents if you can't afford a dollar, and sixty per cent of the people who were unable to do either of them, or unwilling, giving as formerly smaller contributions. This will ever be the case, but the dollar standard of giving has lifted the Church to financial independence in thousands of parishes from New York to San Francisco, from Portland, Oregon, to Portland, Maine, and from Port Angeles, Washington, to Los Angeles, California.

The great St. Patrick's Cathedral of New York last year, under Msgr. Michael J. Lavelle, with the approval of Cardinal Hayes, inaugurated the Dollar-a-Sunday Club and with it, is successfully raising \$600,000 to complete the cathedral for its fiftieth anniversary in 1929.

Incidentally, it is worth noting that the system of distributing printed or mimeographed church notices, instead of reading long lists of Masses, donors, dates of events, etc., from the pulpit, which has been so successfully demonstrated by the Rev. Dr. Coakley's Sacred Heart parish in Pittsburgh, is rapidly spreading, and is one help toward solving the two-fold problem of preaching the word of God and distributing the Eucharistic Bread of Life to the throngs in city churches.

MOTHERS' DAY was explained and promoted in recent issues of AMERICA not without effect, if we are to judge by the reports that have so far come in from various parishes through the country; reports of an immense number thronging to the Holy Table on that day, of whom many made it the occasion for their Easter duty. Nevertheless, we should be extremely glad to obtain more numerous and definite reports if the Rev. Pastors, who had made observations in this respect, will report the same to the Editor.

SPEAKING of the fitness of things, I pick up a daily paper, and notice the following memorial notice:

WARDLAW—In loving memory of our beloved parents, Henry G., Emily Wardlaw, who passed away Feb. 9, 1925, and May 17, 1921, respectively. May they rest in peace. Masses offered.

Two items stand out in that simple notice: first, the commemoration, years after their decease, of the loved ones; and then the offering of Masses, instead of empty decorations and material memorials. In the city of Brooklyn, the admonition: "Please omit flowers. Masses and prayers appreciated," is of daily use in death notices; and the custom can be traced to the action of a Catholic layman, a veteran contributor to AMERICA's columns, who initiated it, in the case of one of his own family, about thirteen years ago. Yet in many other cities such a notice seldom appears.

An interesting sidelight on this same question of the eternal fitness of things—apart from the actual principles involved—is shown by a little paragraph which appeared a couple of years ago in the *American Israelite*, of Cincinnati:

A beautiful custom has grown up of late years among American Jews. It was a general custom, which is not altogether obsolete today, to send flowers, often very expensive floral pieces, to the homes of the dead, to decorate the coffin and room during the preliminary funeral services and afterward at the grave. Often, however, the relatives in announcing the death in the newspapers would state: "Kindly omit flowers," but this was seldom effective. Of late, however, a different custom has come into use and that is instead of sending flowers to send a sum of money to some eleemosynary institution as a memorial to the dead. That money has been so contributed and who the donor is is made public, but the amount of the donation is not given, which is in excellent taste.

After all, is this so different from the ancient custom that we read of as having been observed by Judas Maccabaeus, who "sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins

of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection"? As to the manner of making the contribution, the last words in the paragraph quoted can bear much meditation.

IN our anxiety about ways and schemes, we are all apt to overlook the most necessary and effective factor in solving the whole situation of temporal support, just as it is for all our other problems, that of raising the level of education, intelligence and initiative of the laity.

Franciscan educators, in their usual thorough way, will go to the heart of this problem at the eleventh annual meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference, which will take place at St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N. Y., June 28-30. Father Felix M. Kirsch, O.M. Cap., will take up the important point of developing initiative, responsibility in Catholic college and high-school students: "the principle of self-activity in our schools."

The announcement reads:

Education is the subject that will be treated at this year's meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference. The Friars have played a noble part in education ever since they began their apostolate in America, and recent developments would seem to indicate that their apostolate of teaching will increase largely in the future. Their activities are no longer confined to training the prospective members of their Order, but in different sections of the country they are in charge of high schools and colleges, and indications are that their activities in this direction will increase in the near future. Again, there has been in the latter days much progress in educational science and practice, and it behooves the Friars while remaining loyal to all that has been tried and found true, to adopt of the new whatever promises to make our schools more efficient instruments of the Franciscan apostolate.

Some of the topics indicated bid fair to be more than ordinarily interesting; such as: "Was St. Francis opposed to learning?" "St. Francis' insistence on freedom, plasticity and self-activity"; "First parochial schools in America and the Friars"; "The work of the schoolroom as a form of the Franciscan apostolate"; "Diocesan control of non-Franciscan schools"; "State requirements and standardizing agencies"; "Every Franciscan priest a teacher"; "At which universities and in which countries should future Franciscan teachers be trained for their profession?" etc.

It was all right for good St. Bonaventure to tear his sacred compositions into scraps; but we look forward to seeing these discussions published, as in former years, and made available for the public. THE PILGRIM.

TRIUMPH

Have you too searched, my friend, among the fields
Of heaven for a star, and finding none
Looked for the beauty that a flower yields
In measure smaller, but in essence one?
And have you walked sometime beneath the cover
Of clouds that hang between us and the rain;
Slumbered by stirring waters like a lover,
And felt the cool mist kiss your lips again?

One who has known surrender of the sod
Beneath his feet, and seen the endless roll
Of hill on hill creep to the dying sun
May love this beauty. But yet another one,
Truth in his heart and beauty in his soul,
May see, as star to candlelight, his God.

NORBERT ENGELS.

Dramatics

The Catholic Little Theater

E. FRANCIS McDEVITT

THE founding of any institution is construction on shifting sands if the highest ideals are not the governing influence. It is unthinkable that any group of Catholics engaged in the business of creating an organization so needful and significant as a Little Theater would start out on the wrong foot by first forming the group and casting about for ideals afterwards. Morality and the Catholic spirit in the theater with an individual form and approach to the drama as a happy resultant is the ideal, prior in time and nature, of any Catholic Theater. Without these standards the work of establishing the theater is so much sawing of the air. The ideals of basic morality and the Catholic spirit are the soul, the *raison d'être* of a Catholic Little Theater; without these it would be more profitable to expend time and money on the worthy repertory movements in the broader world of the theater.

No dramatic experiment, however, is worth much if it does not propose to devote a major part of its influence to the formation and growth of a national individuality, regardless of what other principles and ideals it may set up for itself. And the same applies to the Catholic Little Theater which, after all, should be as much concerned with the creation and stimulation of substantial, lasting drama as with the wholesomeness of that drama. So, complementary to the moral and Catholic aims of such a theatrical project is the patriotic or parochial purpose. God, then country, is a deeply rooted Catholic principle that is applicable to every action of the Catholic, irrespective of his position or pursuits.

The test of time will soon spell ruin for the inspiration or cause that has not as a thematic element in its scheme the furthering of national greatness. And certainly the drama, so closely bound up with the life of nations, reflective of, and influencing, the source principles of that life, cannot be taken seriously if the patriotic ideal is ignored.

If the Catholic Little Theater should accomplish, as it can, the creation of an American spirit and individuality in its drama, then it will be the first repertory movement in the United States so far to have done so. Our most flourishing repertory organizations have sedulously avoided the task of developing American drama, although the parochial aspect of any Little Theater movement should logically be an important consideration.

The repertory theaters in New York City are exemplary of all experimental theaters throughout the country. High artistic ideals are not the least consideration of successful organizations such as the Theater Guild and the Civic Repertory Theater. But the admitted benefits accruing from the efforts of such groups are not turned toward the welfare of American drama and dramatists. Shaw and Barrie, the Continental giants, the Quinteros and Martinez Sierra, have given the world drama of a full-bodied variety and are deserving of honor and pres-

entation in their own and other lands. But after all, none of them has ever, or will ever, do much for the American drama itself. As long as influential and independent groups like the Theater Guild continue to favor foreign authors in the selection of their seasonal programs, American drama will remain aborning.

The fact that American theatergoers of the better class must depend for their dramatic entertainment upon the classics, old and new, that cross the seas to American theaters, does not prove that the time is not yet ripe for this country to develop its own dramatic form and soul. Among other things, it merely emphasizes the timidity of producers who hesitate to offer anything other than sure-fire plays, either from this country or Europe. For this timorousness the theatrical tsars cannot be chided. Their public is an uncertain one. Moreover, it cherishes the illusion that what bears the foreign stamp, especially in art, must be first-class, whether the public understands the effusions or not. To that clientele must theatrical entrepreneurs, by their very position in the world of entertainment, cater.

"Not available" is the curt response of the popular producer to the young playwright who timidly submits a play fashioned in an unusual manner out of the American sod. Unless he is fortunate enough to attract the attention of one of the many small and weak groups seeking dramas of the soil, the aspiring author's brain-child is doomed to be still-born. Then it is that the repertory theater should be his hope. But when he turns to such groups he finds that there, too, Pirandello and Shaw are his competitors. As a consequence, another promising playwright is lost to the future of American drama.

What can be accomplished by the Little Theater in this direction is revealed to theater lovers every year when amateur troupes from every corner of the country journey to New York with high hopes of clinching the Belasco cup offered by the theatrical dean for the best one-act play entered in his contests. It is true that the bulk of these organizations also choose the tried and true authors for their presentations and that Schiller and Rostand do monopolize the programs. But occasionally a Paul Green finds his way to New York in a native piece and astute audiences experience a flash of Americanism on the stage that is interest-provoking in its possibilities. Paul Green is a product of the Little Theater, as is Eugene O'Neill, and although that is at present as far as we can go, they alone should vindicate the faith that the all too few struggling amateur groups have in their repertory idea.

American native drama must be born in the repertory theater, for the very essence of the experimental theater is conducive to the necessarily slow and patient process of drawing out and investing with dramatic form the latent American spirit and attitude in the works of unsung authors. Independent of a fickle and unappreciative public, financed solely by persons sincerely interested in the furtherance of worth-while drama, the Little Theater is today in a strategic position to develop an American stage, as it has developed the Gaelic, English and Spanish stages. But so far, for reasons best known to themselves,

our more important repertory groups have varied little from the viewpoint of the Broadway producer who keeps an eye on the esthetic trend of the mob and its effect on the box office, and acts accordingly. The results in the majority of American theaters are only too evident.

The Catholic Little Theater can thus, at the outset, snatch up the firebrand of Americanism, which other repertory groups have permitted to dip, without a repudiation of its own principles. Fortunately, Catholicism is catholic in scope and taste and is proper to all places and times. As the movement for the establishment of a Catholic Little Theater is fast gaining pace, it might not now be so much beside the point to fling out a slogan. What could better appear on the lintels of the Catholic Little Theater than "Morality, Americanism, Catholicism?"

REVIEWS

The Daughter of an Earl. By ELLEN LOUISE (SLADE) BIGELOW. Boston: Marshall, Jones Company. \$4.00.

There is charm and romance to these intimate sketches of the life and accomplishments of Lady Blanche Murphy, eldest daughter of the Earl and Countess of Gainsborough. Her girlhood days take on importance from her family connections, her mother having been one of Queen Victoria's bridesmaids, and her father one of those who "went over to Rome" during the Oxford Movement. She became more significant by her elopement at the age of twenty-five with Mr. T. P. Murphy, a young Irishman of humble extraction, employed as organist in the chapel on her father's estate. In consequence she was disowned, turned American immigrant, landed at Castle Garden in company with her young husband with but fifteen dollars between them and lived in exile and hardship in New York, Virginia, and New Hampshire until her premature death, eleven years later. In the interim she did much writing for the *Catholic World*, *Lippincott's*, *Scribner's*, *Harper's*, and other contemporary magazines. For a decade she was widely read and appreciated. Lady Blanche had a delightful literary style which the romance associated with her career and her beautiful personality could not but enhance. Mrs. Bigelow has done an excellent work in compiling this memoir that should have appeal to all lovers of the romantic and to those interested in the story of American letters, particularly Catholic women. It is enough to note that such distinguished churchmen as Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, Father Hecker, and others find a place in Lady Blanche's biography. By a strange anomaly her American life was closely connected with Episcopal church work and churchmen, yet she never ceased to be a devout Catholic. A younger sister, Lady Edith, was a Sister of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. Mrs. Bigelow inserts little of her own in the volume, but lets Lady Blanche's articles and the correspondence of those who knew and admired this high-born woman who made herself a pauper for love, tell her charming story. Except for occasional faulty spellings (Feber, Frescati, Adoremus), and "Charles" for "Charity" (p. 137, last line), the volume is well made up and enriched by a number of attractive illustrations.

W. I. L.

A Preface to Morals. By WALTER LIPPMANN. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

"The acids of modernity" have quite eaten traditional beliefs away, according to Mr. Lippmann, and the trouble with the present generation is not that it will not believe in them but that it cannot. Faith in a personal God is gone, the old religion is gone, "the modern man has ceased to believe in it, but he has not ceased to be credulous and the need to believe haunts him" (p. 9). These needs, the writer admits, were fully met by the old religious beliefs but the modern mind has risen in rebellion, and yet, to quote one of the most telling sentences in the book: "What most

distinguishes the generation who approached maturity since the debacle of idealism at the end of the War is not their rebellion against the moral code of their parents, but their disillusionment with their own rebellion" (p. 17). The needs are not met, the needs are still there—and modern man is not happy. Though the first section of the book is a masterly analysis of the state of mind of those who are in revolt, an analysis that is piercing and accurate and disclosive, Mr. Lippmann, like so many before him, makes a futile attempt to reconstruct a morality without God. "Disinterestedness" is to be the great foundation of the new "high religion" that is to save mankind and this "disinterestedness," according to Mr. Lippmann, is increasingly prevalent in the world at large. One might very aptly challenge the accuracy of such findings, especially when one comes to "Love in the Great Society," but one may pass up this question of fact and still judge the given solution inadequate. Though Mr. Lippmann is a strong thinker and has given us a book that demands attention from all who are wrestling with the moral problems of today in terms of today, his proposed system of morals is inherently invalid. "Disinterestedness" is a splendid and much needed virtue. But why *must* I be disinterested? Where is the dynamic in Mr. Lippmann's world of morals? He is too close a thinker to miss this, and that is, we suspect, one reason why he modestly titles his book "A Preface to Morals." He is far from dogmatic in proposing his solution as final. Though few recent books are more stimulating, more surcharged with real, hard thinking, one lays "A Preface to Morals" down with an enlarged conviction that if modern man at present cannot believe in a personal God, then the wrong way out is to revamp the motivation of the moral code. Mr. Lippmann's book, coming as it does heavily freighted with a manifest desire to salvage the wreckage and to reinstate man in the dignity of his manhood, proves just one thing—it is high time to show modern man that he *can* believe in a personal God. That is the challenge thrown to the teachers of today—not how to certify a code of morals, new or traditional, on non-theistic grounds; this were a task, hopeless both historically and psychologically. F. P. LeB.

Jørgensen: An Autobiography. Vol. II. Translated by INGEBORG LUND. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. \$3.50.

Johannes Jørgensen, at the close of his first volume, had brought the story of his life up to that point where a final decision on his religious affiliations had to be made. He had abandoned his childhood Lutheranism in his early manhood; he had joined radical, socialistic and atheistic groups; he had found all of these wanting and, in a visit to Assisi in 1894, had been deeply attracted towards Catholicism. The narrative of his spiritual way-faring was related with emotional sincerity, with high romance, with poetic insight and beauty in the first portion of his autobiography. This volume was the November choice of the Catholic Book Club. With the opening of this second volume, Jørgensen is back in his native Denmark. The call of grace was strong, but his mind and will were still rebellious. Francis of Assisi had prepared the way; a son of St. Ignatius opened the door; and Jørgensen, in February, 1896, made his submission to the Church. A terrific soul-struggle preceded his conversion; but a devastating storm overwhelmed him immediately after it. His description of his reaction is harrowing. He remained firm, however, and gradually reconstructed his soul and mind in accordance with Catholic dogma and asceticism. From this year of his conversion until the year with which this second volume ends, that is, shortly before the World War, Jørgensen spent most of his time in foreign travel. He went down into Italy where he gained new fervor at Assisi and learned new loyalties at Rome; while there, he fell under the spell of Leo XIII and his social democracy. Studying and lecturing, he visited France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, with a brief trip to England and to Sweden. Next to Assisi, his favorite retreat was with the monks of Beuron. Through all these years, he struggled with poverty. The necessity for providing for his growing family forced him to work incessantly with his pen. It is well that it was so, for the fruits

of that struggle are in the large number of his books and writings, most of them in defense of Catholic principles and in exposition of Catholic asceticism. This autobiography is primarily the record of a great soul and of an extraordinary intellect. It is the drama of a life, with the joys and the tragedies played out in real action, with the uncertainties of the morrow incalculable but as inevitable as if worked out by a playwright. Wrought in with this soul fiber are the lighter strands of experiences, poetic musings, descriptions of places, conversations with friends and details of family life. This second volume is a fitting sequel to the first; the whole work, when completed, will rank with the classic autobiographies of the Catholic tradition. F. X. T.

Devils, Drugs and Doctors. By HOWARD W. HAGGARD, M.D. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$5.00.

In the satisfaction at the position and triumphs of medical science today, one is apt to forget the long and arduous ways it has traveled. From primitive times, through Egyptian and Greek periods, the Roman pagan ascendancy, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Dr. Haggard brings the reader to the present day in this interesting account of methods of treating or neglecting the sick. The discoveries of Pasteur and Lister, the work of Oliver Wendell Holmes and Semmelweis, the application of their contributions to medical knowledge in the successful eradication of such epidemic diseases as yellow fever, malaria, and typhoid, all within the last century, are well recounted in this history of medicine. Ignorance and superstition, quackery and charlatanism, drugs and mental cures, plagues and pestilences have all contributed their weight in retarding medical advancement. But one may not agree with the author's views on the influence of religion and the Middle Ages. The Christian religion, he states, replaced the rational medicine of Hippocrates by superstition, reason by Revelation, and the teachings of able men by theories originating in fanaticism. Church edicts prohibiting the killing of the unborn child, in the author's mind, were designed *only* to permit baptism! Holy men and women canonized by the Church, according to him, were simply examples of false conceptions of chastity and perverted sex instincts. The Hotel Dieu of Paris is instanced, on the authority of Max Nordau, as an example of lack of care for the sick and the dead. There is no mention of the Grand Hospital of Milan with its 2,000 beds, the thirty hospitals erected in Rome from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries; nor of the 155 hospitals found in Germany alone during those years. While the Sairey Gamps are fully described, the nursing Religious Orders of men and women, notably that of the Holy Ghost, with their definite, detailed rules for the care of the sick, are overlooked. The existence of the medical schools of the great universities of Salerno, Naples, Palermo and Montpellier are dismissed in one line, and such men as William Sailliet and Lanfranc, whom the late Professor Allbutt esteemed so highly, are omitted altogether. The influence of the mind in the cure of bodily diseases is well and rightly evaluated, yet when Doctor Haggard groups charms, amulets and some faith cures with shrines like Lourdes, "vividly described in Zola's novel," one's respect for his knowledge and his judgment is greatly lessened. T. A. McG.

From Confucius to Mencken. Edited by F. H. PRITCHARD. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$5.00.

The recent vogue of anthologies will have prepared the public for this volume. In a series of extracts from writers down through the ages, it attempts a presentation of the story of the development of what we now know as the essay along with a selection of readings to illustrate this evolution. In our own day the essay is a recognized form of literature with fairly definite rules, though elastic enough to include, as the editor here does, musings on almost any topic, irrespective of the form. Thus we find the philosophical speculations of the ancient Greeks and Romans side by side with the familiar papers of Charles Lamb, the satires of Swift, the ascetical reflections of St. Teresa, the moralizing of the Bible, the picturesque descriptions of Heinrich Heine, and the more popular reflections of Montaigne, Addison

and Bacon. The editor draws upon the literature of the Orient as well as of the Continent, Great Britain, and the United States. An introductory note precedes the selections from each distinct country, and brief biographical data is included of the various authors. It is to Mr. Pritchard's credit that he has made a comprehensive selection from the vast amount of material on which he had to draw, and that in general the papers do serve the dual purpose of his volume. Naturally, opinions will differ as to the preference given some selections over others, but most critics will agree that the volume is an excellent cross-section of representative essays from the writers of the world, covering a variety of topics usually as interesting as they are varied.

A. E. A.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The "Catholic Mind."—To bring men closer to Christ, to deepen their knowledge and love of Him, is the chief concern of the Church throughout the year. Yet in June, the month of the Sacred Heart, she seems to urge this mission with special instance. Devotional and doctrinal thoughts apposite to this purpose are offered in the issue of the *Catholic Mind* (America Press, .05 each) for June 8. "Christ Our Physician" is a sermon by Father Carr, C.S.S.R.; "The Sacred Heart of Jesus" reviews the history of the devotion to Christ under this form and shows its struggles and triumphs. "Adoration of the Eucharist" by George O'Neill, S.J., emphasizes the simple fact that Catholics believe that God—the person of Jesus Christ, God and man—becomes present at Mass under the species of bread and wine, and they adore Him as being thus present. "Peace and Catholic Unity" by Joseph F. Thorning, S.J., is an account of the recent meeting of the Catholic Association for International Peace.

Some New Pamphlets.—One of the most important phases of Catholic Action is the work of instructing Catholics and non-Catholics alike on the real teachings of the Church. In many cases there is need for enlightenment not on the entire doctrine of the Church, but only on some one topic that needs a clear presentation. This need is met more effectively by the pamphlet, with its brief, clear, popular exposition than by the weighty volume with exhaustive, scholarly treatment. "The Church and Tolerance" by Michel Riquet, S.J., and "The Modern Indictment of Catholicism" by William I. Lonergan, S.J., are good examples of two types of popular pamphlets. The former presents a reply to a single difficulty; the latter takes a connected series of objections against the Church and treats them in separate pamphlets under the following heads: "Is the Church Intolerant?"; "Is the Church Arrogant?"; "Is the Church Un-American?"; "Is the Church Officious?"; "Is the Church a National Asset?" These are not mere academic questions. The authoritative replies in the above five-cent pamphlets, printed by the America Press, will help much to dispel ignorance and misunderstanding.

The Paulist Press has added to its valuable list the sermon of Cardinal Hayes on "Faith and Science," the reflections of Cardinal Gibbons on "Catholic Loyalty," and the letter of Cardinal Newman to the Duke of Norfolk which explains the Catholic attitude towards "The Pope and the President." The Rev. James J. O'Brien, S.J., tells the neglected story of "The Louisiana and Mississippi Martyrs" and the Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, C.S.P., touches a vital question in "The Church and Eugenics."

The International Catholic Truth Society (407 Bergen Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.) publishes the very timely study by John A. O'Brien, Ph.D., in which he gives reply to the current question: "Does it Matter much what a Man Believes?"; "The Kingdom of Heaven" by the Rev. John G. Hagen, S.J., is a brief series of explanations covering actual doubts and puzzling questions of a convert. "'First Aid' to the Dead" by F. J. Remler, C.M., presents the Catholic view of death and the bereavements it occasions. "The Love of God" by Saint Alphonsus Ligouri, and "Saint Teresa of the Child Jesus and the Holy Face" by John S. Gresser, M.A., are for devotional readings.

From the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland come the following: "Loyalty to Christ Our King" by George Clune; "What is Scholastic Philosophy?" by the Rev. A. H. Ryan, D.D.; "Father Faber" by Wilfrid H. Woollen, M.A.; "Elementary Points of Canon Law for Laymen" by the Rev. M. J. Browne, D.D.

The World's Progress.—The twenty-seventh volume of the "New International Year Book" (Dodd, Mead, \$6.00), edited by Herbert Treadwell Wade, supplies a compendium of the world's progress for the year 1928. The difficulty, so often present, of finding the facts and details of contemporaneous history, is one that this compilation makes easy to overcome. This is especially so in regard to our American annals, though the international scope also is carefully preserved. Events in the fields of art, science, education, religion, politics and other activities are collated authoritatively so that the research student, or inquirer, can appreciate and understand the history of our own times. There are new developments in the summaries of the various notable additions to literature, a feature that has received special commendation, and the treatment of industrial and scientific progress is another valuable and instructive section. As in previous volumes the notable events of the Catholic year with pertinent statistical information have been given appropriate recognition.

Adventure and Sight-Seeing.—Aviation fans and those to whom the heroic appeals will follow with keen interest the thrilling adventures of Captain Einar Lundborg and his companions, especially Lieutenant Schyberg, during their rescue work of the disastrous Nobile expedition in 1928, as chronicled by himself and translated by Alma Louise Olson in "The Arctic Rescue" (Viking Press, \$3.00). There is fascination in every chapter and an abundance of illustrations adds zest to their telling. It was a daring undertaking to which the Captain of the Swedish Air Force was detailed but he gave a splendid account of himself. His narrative is frank and simple on the one hand, and on the other most poignant and dramatic in passages. Without making any pretense at writing a full history of General Nobile's unfortunate expedition, Captain Lundborg is satisfied to describe his own participation in the soul-stirring affair that all the world followed with anxiety when it was occurring.

"South America in a Nutshell" is a fairly accurate description of "The South American Handbook: 1929" (London: Atlantic House. South American Publications) edited by J. A. Hunter. It is a guide to the countries, resources and products of South America, Central America, Cuba, and Mexico. The treatment of the various States is preceded by a general survey of the South American Continent. In makeup it is adapted either to suit the needs of the tourist as a handy guide or to afford others interested in the country south of the United States information they may wish. In general the description and treatment of places is accurate and fair, though one notices a lack of attention to educational opportunities. There are also occasional inaccuracies and misprints. One wonders why the expulsion of the Jesuits should be noted in Argentina, Colombia, Paraguay and elsewhere with no reference to the subsequent lifting of the ban; also just what particular reason makes the editor call attention to Freemasonry and places where information about it may be had in Argentina.

Following the plan of previous narratives of the travel experiences and observations of her nieces, Betty and Mary, Clara E. Laughlin records their adventures in Denmark, Norway and Sweden under the title, "Where It All Comes True in Scandinavia" (Houghton, Mifflin, \$2.50). The girls see much that is quaint in topography, custom and costume, to say nothing of meeting people who have a peculiar attraction for American tourists because of their common northern background. Young people, for whom the volume is written, are bound to enjoy and profit by it. The writer is careful to take occasion from the places visited to introduce much instructive historical, literary and scientific data into her narrative. Everything is presented from the point of view of the children and a number of pen-and-ink sketches are included.

The Woman Who Couldn't Die. Attila. The New Curiosity Shop. Stumbling. Thurman Lucas. Illusion.

Another story of the trackless North, of hare-brained explorers, of adventure and suffering and romance is told by Arthur Stringer in "The Woman Who Couldn't Die" (Bobbs-Merrill. \$2.00). The old, old structure of the white man's superiority over the barbarian is here cast on a new stage and against a completely new set of scenery. The characters are vivid and attractive, and after the first and fundamental madness, their moves are well motivated and their destinies achieved naturally. In episode and description the book is fascinating, rich in imagination, and, granted the primary impossible situation, carries conviction and interest. The author bridges a thousand years from the prologue to the denouement, and gives a tale stirringly told, melodramatic and new. This is a pleasant, vigorous story to fill in some empty hours at the mountain side or by the sea shore.

In "Attila" (Crowell. \$2.00), by Paolo Ettore Santangelo, the barbarian ruler of the North lays siege to old Aquileia, and the invested city becomes a hotbed of religious fanaticism, political intrigue, ambitions, patriotic harangues and general disturbance, all set to the boil by Scaurus, a typical, dyed-in-the-wool villain. In the general scurry, the author neglects to portray his Attila with anything like sharpness, and he introduces such a maze of characters, Greek, Latin, and Goth, that the reader is forced to halt and reread, or be left stranded outside the plot. The book has scant historical value, since it is so sketchy; and little dramatic interest, since it is so involved. With such short-comings one would hardly be rewarded even by a graceful, delicate style.

With Garnet O'Grady as the moving spirit in "The New Curiosity Shop" (Harper. \$1.75), this story for girls must have a real fascination and appeal. She is an attractive heroine, loyal, honest, unafraid. In this pleasing little volume she rises surely and serenely from poverty to wealth, from loneliness to love, from drabness to colorful adventure. Her childhood's watchword was "fairness," and it is that same fairness that makes her so consistent and real in all the stages of her progress—at school, with her foster-brothers, in the midst of difficult English relatives and among amazing Chinese antique collectors. This is a vigorous and healthy book, with a strong dash of Pollyanna for those who still cherish the unsophisticated joy-spirit.

"Stumbling" (Barse. \$2.00), by Dave E. Smalley, is a piece of propaganda in the guise of fiction. As fiction, it has no merit whatsoever. The composition is puerile, the conversation is stilted, the plot is old. As propaganda, it is even worse. The author sets out to prove that capital punishment should be abolished; his reasons—because all crime is disease, because all morality is memory. According to the publisher's notice, "Several criminologists have been impressed with this remarkable book." No doubt many others will be impressed with its utter inanity and banality. If the effort to abolish the death penalty is to make any headway it needs a more vigorous and rational propaganda.

In the opening chapters of "Thurman Lucas" (Macmillan. \$2.00), by Harlan Eugene Reid, the hero, partially because of his own stupidity, is sent to jail; there he becomes a criminal; he escapes and in "the wide open spaces" becomes a man and incidentally, acquires several gold mines. One might comment favorably on several points of the book, but the sordidness and morbidity of the opening chapters ruin the story. One would enjoy solitude in the wide open spaces more than the companionship of "Thurman Lucas."

The title of Arthur Train's diverting story, "Illusion" (Scribner. \$2.50), is based on the thought that the tinsel of the so-called society life is much like that of the circus parade. Each creates an illusion and gives no indication of the reality beneath, nor the utter absence of all reality. But the book is by no means propaganda. The author has no axe to grind. The style is easy and pleasant; the author's own comment is observant and shrewd (at times there is too much of it); the characters are well drawn and make interesting acquaintances. The book deserves a place on the list of Summer reading. Those who enjoy a dash of fiction with their philosophy may give it a more permanent place in their library.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

The Crime Problem

To the Editor of AMERICA:

About all that the ordinary reader can possibly gather with any certainty from the mass of crime-literature with which we are deluged these days is that there is a crime problem and that criminologists and penologists are completely baffled at its solution. Confusion reigns supreme in their ranks. As that astute critic, Henry L. Mencken, writes in his review of Brasol's "The Elements of Crime"; "Only a glance at such a book is needed to convince any rational man that the science of criminology, romantically so called, is bankrupt."

The fact, however, that actual movements have been launched in various parts of the country to investigate and combat crime conditions is a clear indication that thinking people are being aroused by the magnitude and seriousness of this problem and are making positive efforts to solve the problem promptly and adequately. Merely to list these various activities will show the extent of public interest in the problem.

For instance, there is the Chicago Crime Commission, organized in 1919 under the auspices of the Chicago Association of Commerce; the Cleveland Association for Criminal Justice, formerly under the wise direction of Dean Pound and Professor Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School; the Baltimore Criminal Justice Commission, launched under the able supervision of Mr. Alan Johnstone, Jr., and now efficiently directed by Mr. James M. Hepbron; the Citizen's Crime Commission of New York and similar commissions recently organized in Los Angeles, Kansas City and Philadelphia.

There are also functioning wider organizations, such as the Missouri Association for Criminal Justice, organized in 1924; the American Law Institute, offspring of the American Bar Association, and the National Crime Commission, with headquarters in New York. And, last but not least, now we have Mr. Hoover's Law Enforcement Commission.

Another organization which seems to be growing in popularity is the League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. The purpose of this League is to abolish the death penalty in all its forms in every State of the Union, in the District of Columbia and in the United States Civil Code. That this movement is not purely sentimental may be gathered from an inspection of the personnel of the National Executive Committee of the League. It is made up of such illustrious citizens and penologists as Warden Lawes, Sing Sing; Dr. Herman Adler, Dr. Raymond Bye, Mr. E. R. Cass, Mr. Ogden Chisholm, Dr. Hastings Hart, Mr. Adolph Lewisohn and Mr. Frank P. Walsh.

This League is founded on Warden Lawes' very debatable doctrine that "the causes of crime are economic and sociological, with roots far deeper than mere punishment can effect. Whatever deterrence there is in punishment lies in its certainty, not in its severity." One has only to recall the notorious debates staged by Clarence Darrow and Judge Talley, and Mr. Untermeyer and Senator Love, of New York, to know that there is a vast divergence of opinion on this subject.

As a matter of fact, as I have ever insisted in my articles and lectures, the real roots of crime are mainly *moral*, not economic and sociological. Until our criminologists and penologists recognize this fact, the crime problem will never be solved, and there will be no true and lasting criminal reform.

The crime problem reaches farther than reform in criminal procedure and law enforcement; it involves more than a scientific attitude towards penal treatment and discipline; it leaps beyond environment transformation; it implies a great deal more than tinkering with this or that form of civil sanction. The crime problems reaches into the secret stronghold of the heart. Hence,

a real and lasting solution of this problem can be effected only by the inculcation of moral and religious principles and by the formation in our citizens, young and old, of a strong and sturdy character, enabling them to resist the manifold temptations that beset them on all sides.

Baltimore.

JOSEPH J. AYD, S.J.

Marshal Foch

To the Editor of AMERICA:

To Father Doncoeur's fine article in a recent issue, allow me to add something about Marshal Foch which may interest the readers of AMERICA.

A short time before the Marshal's last illness, I received a letter from a friend, S. De Lestapis, who was then private secretary to Marshal Foch. I quote the following extracts from it:

I am still secretary to Marshal Foch. I had occasion recently to type out some of his opinions about Americans. I took them down to send to you. You know that he likes you Americans and appreciates your spirit of enterprise. "Look at America," he says, speaking of youth, "it is vigorous, physically and morally. This is true of the classroom; and at twenty it is carried out into life. If they do not know, they learn; they work; they surmount difficulties. One succeeds only as one wills to." He frequently says that we French have often to take example from you—"sometimes to talk less and to do more." He is truly an admirable man and I am glad to see him at such close quarters. He is an humble man, who remains modest despite the continual demonstrations of sympathy and admiration. And he is an energetic man, who says that he learned to work at eighteen from the Jesuits at Metz. He is a true Christian. His cherished work at present is the construction of a seminary in his native province to further vocations to the priesthood.

AMERICA has scored another triumph in telling the truth about Marshal Foch.

Toledo, O.

A. C. KLAAS, S.J.

Donn Byrne

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Donn Byrne never presumed to write as a Catholic author.

If he were renegade to his old Faith (as Father Kenny wrote on March 30—and he should know) that is a matter between Donn Byrne and his God, and if he were an indifferent Irishman, with a conciliatory rather than a revolutionary outlook, let him be judged by the Irish, not by us.

Are we discussing that Donn Byrne who lived and died or the name that decorates the bright pages that he has left to us?

None other, save Ella Young in her "Master Smith," has so well recaptured for me the spirit that hung about Slieve Gullion in that Tyrone-Derry country, as Donn Byrne did. He is master of the technique of illusion. You walk with him when you read his lines. There is a Magic Carpet in his books.

And I should think that Catholic commentators would find in "Messer Marco Polo," "Destiny Bay," "Blind Raftery" and some of the short stories that breath of robust manhood and that absence of morbid "sexiness" which should merit their applause.

The flower is not less beautiful because its roots are in an earthen vessel. And is it not the Christian and the Catholic thing to be thankful for goodness and beauty wherever we find it?

Passaic, N. J.

WILLIAM M. McBRIDE.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I risk the charge of seeming unknighly. I have waited for some feminine reader to answer Mary Emily King's letter on Donn Byrne in the issue of AMERICA for May 11. None seems willing to answer, or conscious of the need of an answer.

While I admire many things in that letter, I cannot bring myself to believe that the good Sisters of Charity, whose "maxim: *de mortuis nil nisi bonum* led all the rest," would approve their former pupil's application of the dictum. The maxim can't be held as universal. It means, I take it, that when we are free to speak of the dead or not to speak, we should say only good, but there are dead of whom we must speak and must speak bad. Charitable silence or poetic disproportion would be dangerous to the living. For myself, I cannot confidently assert that I can at

will "erase 'Brother Saul'" or other malignant books "from my memory."

An author's work, even fictional, is somehow the image of his mind and heart. I have a right to know that his mind has been warped and his heart been disloyal and reprobate, either that I may keep from reading him or may read with due caution. Even the Sisters of Charity will not dispute this right.

I say "Amen" to Miss King's *requiescat*; I leave Donn Byrne to God. In return won't she please let Father Kenny move a stone from my path on my way to God?

Brooklyn.

JAMES CARABINE.

[This discussion is closed.—Ed. AMERICA.]

"Catholic Action in the Press"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The article entitled "Catholic Action in the Press," by William E. Kerrish, in the issue of AMERICA for May 11 was a masterpiece. I heartily agree with Mr. Kerrish in everything he had to say.

I have frequently tried to work along the lines suggested by his article and, although I do not feel that I am an expert, I have, with the help of another interested friend, succeeded in keeping the local press as well informed as possible, in the interests of truth and accuracy, in matters that affect the Church.

We have recently formed here "The Catholic Layman's League of Virginia," with the approval of the Bishop. It will be our purpose to disseminate Catholic literature and pamphlets to those outside the Church. Several practical questions arise in connection with this work. What sort of pamphlets should we keep on hand? In what way can we create a demand for this literature? Should we advertise our work in local newspapers? We should appreciate advice from older organizations.

Richmond, Va.

M. J. KELLEY.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

One does not wish to take issue with William E. Kerrish, who wrote the article, "Catholic Action in the Press," in the issue of AMERICA for May 11. Yet it would be well for those having the itch for letter-writing not to expect a welcome from editors of the large dailies for letters about things Catholic, and dissipate their energy upon fruitless efforts to have letters printed. It stands to reason that this department of a daily, which is first cousin to the editorial columns (?), is not going to print much of anything the editor dislikes. What is more, it is useless to try to get the very largest dailies to give the Catholic question common justice in the letter columns. My experience with the Chicago *Tribune*, published in a city of well over a million Catholics, read by every Catholic man I know, and rated, I think justly, as being as fair to Catholics as a newspaper can be and hold its circulation in an intolerant country, will bear out this statement.

Each Saturday this paper carries a London letter about the doings of literary men in England. During an entire year the name of Belloc or Chesterton was not mentioned in this letter once. Very naturally, I thought the writer of this letter was one of the many men scattered throughout the English-speaking world who was familiar with the methods of boycott. I wrote to the *Tribune*, calling attention to the fact that, a short time before one of the great debates of the times had taken place in London between Chesterton and Shaw, with Belloc acting as chairman and that the thousands of people around Chicago had to depend on the local diocesan paper for an account of this debate. The letter was not printed and another six months have passed, with Belloc and G. K. C. still apparently doing nothing of interest to the *Tribune* correspondent. Of course, I did not use the ugly word *boycott* in my letter to the *Tribune*.

There is much to be gained, perhaps, from writing letters to the smaller dailies; but, evidently, to get justice from those that count, we must sit down and wait for the crisis. The crisis, let us hope, will arrive when Catholics get wealth and influence enough to establish their own dailies in the large cities.

LaGrange, Ill.

C. V. HIGGINS.